Justification Justified:

OR THE GREAT

DOCTRINE

of Justification,

Stated according to the

HOLY SCRIPTURES,

And the Judgment of

PROTESTANT DIVINES.

By which several Fundamental Truths, always owned by the Church of *England*, since the Reformation, are Explain'd Confirm'd, and Vindicated from the Errors of

Mr. *William Sherlock*.

Also a Discourse in Answer to him concerning

ACQUAINTANCE

WITH THE

PERSON of CHRIST.

By *SAMUEL ROLLS*.

London, Printed for the Author, and are to be Sold at *B. Billing*. at the Printing-Press in *Corn-hill*. 1674.

THESES

Of Juſtification.

I.

THE word *Juſtification* is taken either *Actively*, for the Act of God who juſtifieth (or the Act of God in juſtifying) or *Paſſively*, for the priviledge (or as it is a priviledge) of ſuch who are Juſtified.

II.

The *Active*, and *Paſſive* Juſtification, or *Juſtification* Actively, and Paſſively taken, are not two things, or two diſtinct *ſpecies*, or kinds of Juſtification, but one, and the ſame, diverſly conſidered, or under diſtinct reſpects, and habitudes. As the love wherewith I love another man, and the love wherewith he is belov'd of me, are one and the ſame, but may be conſidered either as in me, as the *Subject* of that love, or as terminated upon him as the *Object*.

III.

Though *Active* and *Passive* Justification do admit of a distinct consideration, yet they can never be really separated, or apart, or one without the other. For God can never be said to justifie, but when some body is Justified by him, for every Action must have an Object, and every Agent, a Patient. Therefore that justification from Eternity which some speak of, is only God's Decree to justifie such and such in time, *viz.* when they should come to believe in Christ, *Gal.* 3. 8. *And the Scripture fore-seeing that God would justifie the Gentiles through Faith.*

Yet notwithstanding Justification Active and Passive are the same thing (only considered the first as coming from God, and the latter as received or applyed by the Believer) neither can they be separated, yet this distinction hath it's use. For when we say Faith is an Instrument of our *Justification* it is not as Justification is *Actively* considered; for how can any Action of Man be an Instrument to God's Action? But as we are Passively justified we are *justified by believing*; it's not our faith that doth produce our Justification properly; Therefore when it is said, that only *Faith justifieth*, it is to be resolved Passively. By Faith only we are justified.

IV.

The proper definition of Justification is such as

as doth take in both that which we call *Active*, and that which we call *Passive*: I say, both the *Active*, and *Passive*, Justification (as they are called) are involved, or included, in the usual definition of Justification, which shews that they are really the same thing, though there be some notional difference betwixt them.

V.

Justification (to give you the definition of it) is a gracious Act, or Sentence of God, whereby every true Believer is acquitted, discharged, and absolved, of, and from his sins, and is accounted, declared, and pronounced just, and righteous only for the Righteousness, or Obedience of Christ imputed to him, and received by Faith alone. *Vide Amef. p.* 215. Sect. 6. *Rom.* 3. 22. 24.

VI.

The fore-said Definition cannot be much, (if at all) amiss, for that it taketh in all, or almost all the causes of Justification, both *Actively*, and *Passively* considered.

VII.

For first, it assigneth the *Efficient* cause of *Justification*, namely, God. For he it is who justifieth, *Rom.* 4. 5. I have therefore calld it an Act of God. Moreover, to shew what manner of Act, in, or of God the justifying of a sinner is, I call it *a Sentence* of God, the Supreme Judge, thereby intimating it is a *forin-*

ſick, or *Court-Act*, an Act of Law, or Judicature (as when a Judge acquitteth a Man that hath ſatisfied the Law by himſelf, or Proxy, and diſchargeth him by Proclamation, &c.) not a *Phyſical* Act, as when a Phyſitian by proper Remedies maketh a ſick man well, nor yet a *moral* Act, as when a Father by good Counſel, and Example is Inſtrumental to make a bad Son to become good. For the Act of a Judge when he acquitteth an accuſed Man is of a diſtinct Nature from both of theſe. To *juſtifie* is no where either in the Old, or New Teſtament, taken in any other than a *forinſick* ſenſe, *Deut.* 25. 1. 1 *King.* 8. 32. 2 *Chron.* 6. 23. *Job.* 9. 20. *Prov.* 17. 15. *Iſa.* 50. 8. *Mat.* 12. 37. *Rom.* 2. 13. Compared with 12, and 3, 16. & 8. 32, 33. So *Rom.* 6. 7. it ſignifies to be delivered *a pœna*, as one that is acquitted at Law. So the *Temple* was juſtified, when freed from the Infamy which it was laid under by reaſon of the Image of *Jupiter Olympius* ſet up there by *Antiochus*, Dan. 8. 14. See alſo *Job* 9. *v.* 23. 20. *Pſal.* 143. 2. *Iſa.* 53. 11. *Luke* 8. 14. *Acts* 13. 39. 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. 6. 11. *Titus* 3. 7. Alſo *Dan.* 12. 3. when Men are ſaid to *juſtifie* it may be underſtood in this ſenſe of men as *Inſtrumental*. Alſo that in *Rev.* 22. 11. ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω may be thus underſtood, Let him that is juſtified continue to apply the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to himſelf by Faith, in order to his being more and more Actually juſtified from his new ſins, &c.

VIII.

The fore-ſaid Definition containeth the *Cauſa*

ſa Proegoumena of *Juſtification*, or that whereby God was inwardly (or from within) moved, and excited to juſtifie Believers in ſuch a way and manner as hath been expreſſed, *viz.* the *Free Grace*, Mercy, and good will of God towards them. Therefore I have called it a gracious Act of God, or an Act of God's free-Grace. But by the way obſerve, that the Juſtifying of a Sinner it's being an Act of *Free-Grace* does not hinder but it may be an Act of *Juſtice* too, as it is, all things conſidered, particularly conſidering the *Satisfaction* given by Chriſt. If we reſpect the Notation or Original of the word *juſtifie*, it ſhould ſignifie to *make juſt* as *Sanctifie to make Holy*. But if we regard the common uſe of it, it no more ſo imports as it is *Sanctifie* uſed of God imports *to make holy* or *magnifie* in common uſe of ſpeech *to make great*. And it is the ordinary uſe of words not their *Original* without it, that muſt carry it, and determine what they do import, and how they are to be underſtood. Excellent Mr. *Gataker* in his Treatiſe of *Juſtification*, p. 8. ſaith, of *Dan.* 12. 3 *Rev.* 22. 11. *Theſe I conceive are the only two places in Scripture where the term of juſtifying or thoſe anſwering it are thus uſed, viz.* To make a man inherently, or habitually juſt by a good quality infuſed, or wrought into him. And yet even thoſe two places may admit of the ſame Conſtruction of the word *Juſtifie*, as hath been given of all the reſt, *vid. Theſ.* 7.

That the Free Grace of God was that which from within did move him to juſtifie a ſinner is

clearly held forth, *Rom.* 3. 24. *Being juſtified freely by his Grace.* And *Eph.* 2. 8. *For by Grace are ye ſaved through Faith.* And *Titus* 3. 7.

IX.

Juſtification is rightly called an Act of God's *Free Grace*, and Mercy (or a gracious Act of God) (though there be full Satisfaction in the caſe) upon ſeveral accounts. As namely, 1. Becauſe God accepteth of the obedience of one for another, of Chriſt for us, which he might have choſen whether he would have done, for he might have inſiſted upon Satisfaction from the Perſon offending. God might have ſaid, that *The very Soul which hath ſinned it ſhall dye.* Doubtleſs the Superiors of *Zaleucus* (had he had any) might have choſen whether they would have accepted of one of his Eyes, inſtead of one of his Sons, who had forfeited both. 2. God in ſtrictneſs of Juſtice might have required the *idem*, the ſelf-ſame ſatisfaction which the Law required, or *penalty* which the Law threatned, *viz.* the eternal deſtruction of Sinners: but he has been pleaſed to accept of the *tantundem*, or *tantamount*, from Chriſt, which is as if a Man were bound to pay me 1000 *l.* in Lawful money of *England*, and I ſhould accept of a *Jewel*, one, or more, to that value, inſtead thereof, which every body knows I was not bound to do, or might refuſe. But 3. It was yet a far greater Act of Grace than either of the former, for God to provide, and procure a Surety, and a Satisfaction, at his own Coſt, and Charges (as

Zaleu-

Zaleucus redeemed one of his Son's forfeited Eyes with one of his own.) For God not only to find out a *ranſom*, and Chriſt to give himſelf to be that, and the Holy Ghoſt, who was Eſſentially one with the Father and Son, to conſent thereunto (for this was done by joynt conſent of all the three Perſons, who ſaid in effect, Let us redeem Man, as let us make Man) was an Act of infinite Grace, and Mercy. 4. For God to pitch upon Man as an object of juſtifying Love, and to Elect him thereunto from Eternity, whilſt the fallen Angels were paſſed by, was an Act of meer Free Grace.

X.

The *Final* cauſes of our *Juſtification*, or of God's juſtifying us, were as follow, *viz.* the ſatisfying of the Love, and Grace of God in ſaving of Believers, for it is a Satisfaction to Love to do good to thoſe that are beloved of us. So 'tis ſaid of Chriſt, that *he ſhall ſee of the travel of his Soul and ſhall be ſatisfied*, and of God, *that Mercy pleaſeth him, and therein doth he delight*. I ſay, the giving content and ſatisfaction to Divine Love, in, and by the Salvation of Sinners; as alſo to magnifie, and glorifie the Riches of God's Grace, and Mercy, thereby, are the two great ends, or *Final Cauſes* of Juſtification, or of God's juſtifying us (which may after a ſort be reduced to the *Proegumenal* cauſe, as being cauſes inwardly moving God thereunto.)

XI.

The *Final Cauſes* of *Juſtification*, *Paſſively* taken, or of our being juſtified, are (beſides thoſe fore-mentioned) that we ſhould be to the praiſe of the glory of God's grace, in juſtifying us, by glorifying him by a holy converſation, *that being delivered out of the hands of our Enemies, we ſhould ſerve God in Righteouſneſs and Holyneſs all our dayes*, Luke 1. 74, 75. *Who gave himſelf for us that he might redeem us from all Iniquity, and might purifie to himſelf a peculiar People zealous of good works*, Titus 2. 14. This laſt is the only cauſe of Juſtification that hath not been expreſt in the definition thereof.

XII.

The definition of Juſtification which we have given, containeth alſo the *Material Cauſe* thereof, *viz.* the Righteouſneſs, or Obedience of Chriſt: which may otherwiſe be called the *meritorious cauſe*, or the *Procatarctical*, or external moving cauſe thereof. For when a *material cauſe* is aſſigned of things that are immaterial, or ſpiritual, the word *matter*, or material, muſt needs be taken in a *moral*, or *ſpiritual* ſenſe, and not in a ſtrict ſenſe, for *matter* properly ſo called.

So that there is no incongruity in terming the *meritorious* cauſe the *material* cauſe of our Juſtification, or the *Procatarctical*, or procuring cauſe thereof, or *vice verſa*. The material cauſe of a thing (ſay Logicians) is, *ex qua res eſt*, or that out of which, or of which, or by which any

any thing is. Now, the Obedience of Jeſus Chriſt, is that out of which our Righteouſneſs before God doth ſpring, or reſult, or by, and for which, we are juſtified, or, which was the only thing from without (*ab extra*) primarily moving God to juſtifie us.

But according to Mr. *Sh.* our ſincere obedience to the Goſpel is the matter of our Righteouſneſs before God, or that by which we are juſtified.

XIII.

Many ſeveral Perſons, and things are ſaid to *juſtifie*, in different wayes, and reſpects. *ex gr.* 1. God juſtifies as a *Judge* by his definitive Sentence, and ſo Chriſt who is the Judge of the World, will juſtifie all the Elect in that great day of diſtinction. 2. Chriſt juſtifies more ways than one, *viz.* 1. By his *Blood*, as the price of our juſtification, *Rom.* 5. 9. 18, 19. *Acts* 13. 39. 2. Chriſt juſtifieth as an *Advocate*, *John* 2. 1, 2. alledging his own Obedience in our ſtead for our juſtification. 3. The *Law* is ſaid to juſtifie, becauſe it is the *Rule* by which the Judge proceeds in juſtification, *John* 7. 51. 4. *Witneſſes* are ſaid to juſtifie, when their evidence helps to clear the party accuſed. In that ſenſe Conſcience is ſaid to excuſe, or juſtifie, 1 *John* 3. 20, 21. 5. Whatſoever is pleaded as a ſufficient ground, or motive, for which a Man may be cleared from the fault objected againſt him is ſaid to *juſtifie*. So *works* juſtifie, *Jam.* 2. 22. 24. And *words*, Mat. 12. 37. as *evidences* that are

pro-

produced to manifeſt innocency, or integrity. 6. That which is a means to make a man partaker of Chriſts Righteouſneſs is alſo ſaid to *juſtifie*; ſo *Faith* juſtifies, *&c.* But when the queſtion is put whereby, or by what a ſinner is juſtified in the ſight of God? it is uſually intended of the *formal cauſe* of our *Juſtification*; as if it had been put in theſe words, How comes it to paſs that Believers are righteous in Gods account, as if they had (which they have not) a perfect Righteouſneſs formally inherent in themſelves? or whence is it that Believers are by God diſcharg'd from Hell, and accepted Righteous to eternal life, as if they were *formally* Righteous by a perfect Righteouſneſs of their own? To which the Anſwer is, It is by means of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to them, and by means of that imputation, made as beneficial to them, as if it were formally inherent in them. Now the Definition given doth alſo contain the *formal cauſe* of our Juſtification, *viz.* the imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, or Obedience to us. For as a man is a man by being indued with a reaſonable ſoul; (or that is the *form*, or *formalis ratio* of a man) ſo a Believer is juſtified by vertue of having the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to him, or being inveſted with that Righteouſneſs. But now according to Mr. *Sh.* the acceptation of our ſincere Obedience to the Goſpel is the *formal cauſe* of our Juſtification, or that by vertue whereof we become Juſtified,

XIV.

When we call the Imputation of Chriſt his Righteouſneſs, or Obedience, the *Formal Cauſe* of Juſtification; we do not take the word *Form*, or *Formal* cauſe ſtrictly, and Phyſically, as they do who thus define it, *viz. Forma eſt interna cauſa per quam res eſt id quod eſt.* For the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is not internal, nor inherent, in juſtified perſons; but external, foraign, and imputed; (though as to Juſtification it ſelf, it is intrinſical, and ſo is the imputing of it) but our meaning is this, that the manner of Gods juſtifying a ſinner, is by imputing to him the Righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt. A man doth not become juſtified, or is not conſtituted juſt by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt inhering in him, or dwelling in him, as the ſoul doth in the body; but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt doth *Ingredi Juſtificationem*, though not *Juſtificatum*: *i. e.* entereth into the definition of *Juſtification*, though not into the Perſon Juſtified.

XV.

When we ſay that God imputeth Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to us, our meaning is nothing elſe but this; that he graciouſly accepts for us, and in our behalf the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as if we had in our own perſons, ſatisfied his Law. Biſhop *Davenant* ſaith, *p.* 359. *de Juſtitia Actuali*, &c. *Imputare alicui idem eſt in hac queſtione, atque inter ea quæ ſunt ipſius, & ad eum pertinent, illud connumerare, & recenſere.*

Alſo

Alſo B. *Davenant*, p. 313. *Quando formalem cauſam quærimus juſtitiæ noſtræ, id quærimus propter quod peccator in gratiam Dei recipitur. per quod immediate Deo gratus, & ad vitam æternam acceptus ſtat, cujus beneficio damnatoriam legis ſententiam evadere, denique quo niti poſſit ac debeat ad Cœleſtis judicis favorem & approbationem conſequendam.*

XVI.

The word *Forme* or *Formes*, is uſually applyed not only to *ſubſtantial* Forms, which do give *eſſe ſimpliciter*, but alſo to *accidental* Forms, which do give *eſſe tale*: ſo we ſay *learning* is the *form* by which a man is *learned*, and *heat* the form by which the fire is *hot*. So here, the *form* of *juſtification*, is that by which a juſtified man is not only reputed, and denominated ſuch before God, but is ſo made, and conſtituted. Now becauſe by a paſſive denomination a man is ſaid to be juſtified; it is not neceſſary that this denomination be taken from an inherent form, or ſhould ſuppoſe an inherent form. *Ex gr.* when we ſay that a man is beloved, honored, condemned, or acquitted, all theſe things may be ſaid of him in whom there is no inherent form, which may found, or be the foundation of theſe denominations. *Vaſquez* ſaith, *Poteſt aliquid dici juſtum extrinſica & aliena juſtitia.*

N. B But yet the name *juſt*, is not in Scripture ſo uſually taken from an extrinſick form, as is the name *juſtified*; for men are called Righteous, or holy in Scripture, from an inherent Righ-

Righteouſneſs, begun in them, but *juſtified* only from the moſt perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to them.

If therefore the name of a juſtified perſon, and the benefit of Juſtification, be not had by any form inherent in us, but by a reſpect had to ſomething that is extrinſical, it is manifeſt that we are juſtified by way of *Imputation*, and that that extrinſick Righteouſneſs, though it be not a Phyſical form within us; yet doth ſupply the room of ſuch a thing, and in that ſenſe is rightly called the *formal cauſe* of Juſtification. *Vide Davenant*, p. 346. *Per formalem cauſam juſtificationis nihil aliud intelligimus quam illud per quod ſtamus in conſpectu Dei, a damnatione liberati, innocentes, gratificati, & ad vitam æternam acceptati*, &c.

XVII.

That the Imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the *Formal cauſe* of Juſtification, B. *Davenant* ſheweth by the following Arguments, *p.* 362.

XVIII.

The benefit of Chriſt's imputed Righteouſneſs doth not conſiſt in this, that thereby we are indowed with an inherent Righteouſneſs which may abide the ſtrict judgment of God; but that apprehending Chriſt by Faith, with reſpect to his Merits, we may be abſolved from the condemning power of the Law, and accepted to life eternal. *Ergo*, For this he quotes *Joh.* 3. 16. and 18.

18. & *Joh.* 5. 24. *He that believeth on him that ſent me ſhall not come into Judgment* (*or Condemnation*, &c. Here, ſaith he, I query what is the Judgment which they who believe on Chriſt ſhall not come into, or are exempted from for Chriſt's ſake? Doubtleſs, ſaith he, it is that ſtrict Judgment of God, when a Man is examined according to the Rule of the *Law*, and is pronounced Righteous, or unrighteous, according as he is found exactly to anſwer, or not to anſwer thereunto, and is accordingly rewarded, or puniſhed. Therefore the Juſtification, and Salvation of Believers, depends upon theſe, that by, and for the merits of Chriſt, they ſhall be ſo dealt with, as if they had a perfect Legal Righteouſneſs in themſelves, p. 362, 368.

XIX.

The diſobedience of *Adam* is ſo imputed to his Poſterity that with reſpect to that they ſtand guilty before God, and condemn'd to eternal puniſhment: Therefore the Obedience of Chriſt is ſo imputed to his Myſtical Members, that with reſpect to that, they ſtand *juſtified* before God, and accepted to Eternal Life. The Conſequence he proves from *Rom.* 5. 19. *Bellarmin* himſelf, *De Amiſſ. Gratiæ. Lib.* 5. 17. ſaith, *the Diſobedience wilfully committed by* Adam *made his Poſterity guilty of Death, and hateful to God, and that that very ſin of his was communicated to us by imputation. For it was imputed* (ſaith he) *to all that are born of* Adam (*or that ſprang from* Adam) *becauſe we all being in the loins of*

of Adam *did ſin in him, and by him when he ſinned.* See B. *Davenant*, p. 363. 364.

XX.

God with reſpect to the Obedience of Chriſt, even to the death of the Croſs, hath freed us from the puniſhment due to the tranſgreſſors of the *Law*, by imputing to us that Satisfaction of another as if it had been ours. *Ergo*; *Bellarmin* himſelf, *De Juſtit Lib.* 2. *Cap.* 10. ſaith, *Chriſt is ſaid to be our Righteouſneſs becauſe he ſatisfied his Father for us, and doth ſo communicate that ſatisfaction to us, when he juſtifieth us, that it may be called our ſatisfaction, and righteouſneſs. It would not be abſurd* (ſaith he) *if one ſhould ſay that the Righteouſneſs and merits of Chriſt are imputed to us for that they are given and applyed to us as if we had ſatisfied God our ſelves.* B. Davenant, p. 364. How much more Orthodox is *Bellarmin* himſelf in this laſt paſſage (if not in the former alſo) than Mr. *Sh.*?

XXI.

Scripture acknowledgeth the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to be ours who believe, *viz.* in, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. & *Phil.* 3. 9. Now, ours it cannot be otherwiſe than by *Imputation.* Now the making of that perfect Righteouſneſs ours, wherefore is it but to ſupply the abſence of that perfect Righteouſneſs which ought to be in us, but is not? Therefore the Imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, doth in Juſtification ſupply the place of a *Formal Cauſe.* B. *Davenant*, p. 366.

XXII.

XXII.

Again, B. *Davenant* uſeth this Argument. They who being cloathed with Chriſt, and his Righteouſneſs are accepted to eternal Life, in them this imputed Righteouſneſs (as to the benefit of Juſtification,) is in the Nature of a formal Cauſe. But all Believers are ſo cloathed with Chriſt, and his Righteouſneſs, *Gal.* 6. 26, 27. *Eph.* 1. 6. *Who hath made us accepted to himſelf in his beloved.* Therefore our imperfect Righteouſneſs cannot render us accepted with God to Eternal Life, but it behoveth us to appear before him cloathed with the Garment of our Elder Brother, as *Jacob* did when he fought the Bleſſing. Which Similitude Mr. *Sh.* derideth, yet *Bellarmin* himſelf ſaith, *Sano modo ſimilitudinem indumenti Chriſti accommodari poſſe juſtitiæ imputatæ.* B. *Davenant* adds, that we being cloathed with the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt by God's donation, and the application of Faith, it doth no leſs conduce to our Juſtification than it would do if it were *formally* inherent, and in that ſenſe we may call it the *formal Cauſe* of Juſtification.

XXIII.

Again, the Biſhop aforeſaid argueth thus, He who was made a *Surety* for us, and took upon him the payment of our whole Debt, his Obedience is imputed to us, and being imputed availeth as much as if it were inherent in us. But ſo was Chriſt, *Heb.* 7. 22. Now to be as

advan-

advantagious, and available to us, as if it were inherent, is (ſaith he) *ſupplere vicem cauſæ formalis.* Hence we are ſaid to be compleat in Chriſt. Dr. *Hammond*, in his Catechiſm, p. 489. puts this Queſtion, *How was the pardon of ſin purchaſed?* His Anſwer is, *By the ſatisfaction wrought by him in his ſufferings taking upon him to be our Surety, and to ſuffer in our ſtead, that as many as are renewed by his Grace may be releaſed by his ſufferings*, &c.

XXIV.

Another Argument of Bp. *D.* is this.

The Scriptures which do affirm that Faith is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs do plainly ſhew that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to Believers; for thoſe Texts muſt needs be meant of Faith as it apprehendeth it's object, and applyeth Chriſt and his ſaving Righteouſneſs to believers. For nothing is more uſual than to attribute that to the cauſe applying which properly and immediately belongs to the thing applyed; whereas *Bellarmin* calleth Imputed Righteouſneſs, *Imaginatio Juſtitiæ, cui veritas non reſpondet* (or, with Mr. *Sh. an imaginary Righteouſneſs*;) Bp. *D.* replyeth, *When God reputes us Righteous by Faith, the Truth anſwering to this eſtimation is not the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt formally inherent in us, but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt really participated, and given to us by Divine appointment: God does not think us to be inherently juſt, but for that imputation he eſteems us freed from the damnation of Sin, and accepted to Eternal Life.*

XXV.

The fore-ſaid Excellent Biſhop argueth further thus; either the Imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the *Formal Cauſe* of our *Juſtification*, or it only interveneth to obtain for us ſome other *Formal Cauſe* of our Juſtification. But not the latter, ſaith he, *Ergo* the former.

He goes on to ſhew how our firſt προσαγωγη, or entrance into the favour of God, is by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, apprehended by Faith, *Rom.* 8. 5. *Being juſtified by Faith we have Peace with God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* v. 2. *By whom alſo we have acceſs by Faith into this grace.* Then that our *ſtanding*, or abiding, and continuing in that favour of God, is not by our own Righteouſneſs he proveth from the following words, *wherein we ſtand*, viz. by the ſame Faith, and by the ſame Chriſt. Yea, further (ſaith he) our acceptation to Glory is not from inherent Righteouſneſs, but from our Mediator and his Righteouſneſs, for it followeth; *And rejoyce* (viz. by Faith) *in hope of the glory of God*: i. e. by the ſame Faith we expect glory, by the ſame Chriſt.

XXVI.

Another Argument which *B. Davenant* uſeth, is this; Imputed Kighteouſneſs is nothing elſe but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt applyed, and given to us, to produce ſome Spiritual effect. For when God with reſpect unto Chriſt his Righteouſneſs vouchſafeth to deal with us as if it

it were our own (inherently) then he is said to impute it to us. But Righteousness so applyed and given to us, though it be not in us after the manner of a Physical form, yet hath the efficacy of a *Formal Cause* by Divine Ordination and Acceptation. One and the same Righteousness of Christ considered in its self, and its own worth is the *Meritorious cause* of our Justification, but considered as *imputed*, given, and applyed as their own to all Believers, supplyes the place of a *Formal Cause*.

XXVII.

The last Argument of the Excellent Bishop afore said proving the *Imputation* of Christ his Righteousness to be the *Formal Cause* of our Justification, is as followeth.

If there be but one δικαίωμα or Righteousness that can avail to Justification of Life, and that be the Obedience of Christ alone, then certain it is that Justification doth belong to none but those that are partakers of that Righteousness. But this is in plain words Asserted by the Apostle, *Rom.* 5. 18. *For as by the offence of one Judgment came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the Righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men to Justification of life.* δι ἑνὸς δικαιώματος, *per unam justitiam exactam.* Therefore the Justification of life doth not redound from any quality inherent in us, but this compleat Righteousness of our Mediator, given, and imputed to us. Our inherent Righteousness hath not (saith he) δικαίωμα, that is, (according to him) a compleat, and

abſolute perfection of Righteouſneſs; therefore it cannot produce in us juſtification of life, which is a moſt perfect effect of a moſt perfect cauſe: Therefore the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is to us inſtead of a *Formal cauſe* conſtituting our *Juſtification*. In *Rom.* 5 18. where it is ſaid, *By the Righteouſneſs of one*, δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος, the true gift came upon all to the Juſtification of life εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, by the word δικαίωμα is meant not *Juſtification*, the effect, called δικαίωσις; but the one only Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, whereby we are juſtified. And it ſeems more proper to tranſlate it *So by one Righteouſneſs*, δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος *per unam* rather than *per unius juſtitiam*; For the Apoſtle does not ſay διὰ δικαιώματος τοῦ ἑνὸς (as in the next, διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς) with an article, and the Adjective put after the Subſtantive. Moreover, to tranſlate it by *one* Righteouſneſs, rather than by the *Righteouſneſs of one* doth better accord and anſwer to δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος, *Rom.* 5. 18. *As by one offence* (and ſo it is in our Margent) moreover the word δικαίωμα there ſeems to ſignifie more than *Juſtitia*, viz. *Juſtificamen*, or *Juſtificamentem* (if we may make ſuch words) or as the *French* tranſlate it, *Juſtice Juſtifiante*.

XXVIII.

We have put in the word, *only*, into the Definition of *Juſtification*, that thereby we might exclude all falſely pretended *Material*, and *Formal* cauſes of our Juſtification, by ſaying we are accounted Righteous, *only*, for the Righteouſneſs,

teouſneſs, and Obedience of Chriſt, *&c.* to ſhew, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the only *Matter*, and the *Imputation* thereof the only *Forme* of our Juſtification.

XXIX.

To the Arguments which have been already brought, I would add, If *Inherent Righteouſneſs* be not the *Formal cauſe* of our Juſtification, either we may be juſtified without any Righteouſneſs at all, or we muſt be juſtified by *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, as the *Formal* cauſe of our Juſtification; But neither can we be juſtified without any real Righteouſneſs on the one hand, nor yet by vertue of an *Inherent Righteouſneſs* on the other hand: *Ergo*, we muſt be juſtified by Righteouſneſs Imputed.

XXX.

Common ſenſe will tell us, that for a man to be, or to be made Righteous, (which is all one with *Juſtified*, for ſo are all that are Juſtified) without any Righteouſneſs of his own inherent, or imputed, is againſt ſenſe, and reaſon, as much as to ſay that a man can be truly rich, and yet neither have any eſtate of his own, nor the uſe of any other mans; or be very wiſe, and yet neither have any head-piece of his own, nor yet the advice and counſel of any other wiſer than himſelf. The judgment of God is according to truth. If God did not make a Believer perfectly Righteous, as to guilt, and condemnation, by vertue of Chriſt's Obedience imputed

to him, he could not account him ſo, *&c.* Philoſophers ſay *Deus ipſe non poteſt ſupplere defectum cauſæ formalis. ex gr.* God cannot make a man without a reaſonable ſoul, or a wiſe man without wiſdome, *&c.* For ſo to do doth *implicare.*

XXXI.

Inherent Righteouſneſs cannot be the *formal cauſe* of our *Juſtification*: Therefore *Imputed* muſt, ſith we cannot be juſtified without a Righteouſneſs, and there are but theſe two ſorts: For all Righteouſneſs is either *Inherent*, or *Imputed.*

XXXII.

To prove that we cannot be juſtified by Inherent Righteouſneſs, or that, that cannot be the Formal cauſe of our Juſtification Bp. *D.* brings ſeven following Arguments contained in ſeveral Paragraphs, or Sections, one in each *&c.* p. 346.

XXXIII.

If we are juſtified by Inherent Righteouſneſs, as the Formal cauſe, than either by Habitual, or Actual, not by Habitual (according to the Papiſts) For many of them do ſay that it is not *de fide*, but a meer probable thing that there is any ſuch thing as a *habit*, or habits of Grace infuſed into Believers. And as for Actual Righteouſneſs, the *Counſel of TRENT*, denieth that any man is *Juſtified* thereby, *Bellarmin* de *Juſtit.* lib. 2. cap. 15. Neither can Actual Righteouſneſs be counted *Inherent*, properly, becauſe

it

it conſiſts not in permanent qualities, but in tranſient acts, which are ſaid to *flow* from the ſoul, not to *inhere* in it, for they abide no where.

XXXIV.

If we are formally juſtified by Inherent Righteouſneſs, then it muſt be by that Inherent perfect Righteouſneſs which is accompanied with Actual Righteouſneſs that is perfect alſo: but there is no ſuch Inherent Righteouſneſs in this life; and if there were, and he that had it ſhould not perfectly live, and act according to it, he would be ſo far from being juſtifi'd thereby, that it would aggravate his Condemnation. *That our Juſtification muſt be by a perfect Righteouſneſs, and no otherwiſe is evident, becauſe* the Scripture ſaith, *curſed is he that continueth not in all to do them*, Gal. 3. 10. *Alſo for* that the Apoſtle having ſaid, *By the works of the Law is no fleſh juſtified in Gods ſight, which he confirms in* the remainder of that, *and in the* next whole Chapter, *viz. Rom.* 4. alſo in *Gal.* 3. *The Arguments which he* brings to prove it are ſuch as theſe, *viz. Becauſe we have all ſinned, and come ſhort of the glory of God Becauſe we are juſtified* δωρεαν, which implies a deficiency of Merit. Alſo becauſe they are ſaid to be *Bleſſed whoſe ſins are covered, which implies*, that the works of Juſtified Perſons are mixt with ſin, and therefore cannot juſtifie them. Alſo, If Juſtification were by works, Chriſt had died in vain, and Faith were vain, we were yet under the Curſe, *&c. All which paſſages do ſhew that an imperfect Righteouſneſs cannot juſtifie us*, (for

elſe they are not concluſive) and a perfect inherent Righteouſneſs we neither have, nor can have in this Life.

Whereas the Papiſts ſay, that the works by St. *Paul* excluded from Juſtification, are only the works of the *Unregenerate*: that is manifeſtly falſe; for in the places quoted, he excludeth from Juſtification the Works of *Abraham* when Circumciſed, Regenerate, and a true Believer, *Rom.* 4. *Gal.* 3. So *David* acknowledgeth that the works of the Regenerate could not ſtand before the ſtrict Judgment of God, *Pſal.* 143. 2. ſee *Gal.* 2. 15, 16.

XXXVI.

The *Formal Cauſe* of Juſtification ought to have ſuch efficacy, as after ſin committed, to compenſate, or ſatisfie for the injury done to the Divine Majeſty: But by a Created quality (ſuch as *Inherent* Righteouſneſs is) God cannot be ſatisfied for the injury done to him. The offence given, and injury done to God by every wilful (or mortal) ſin is infinite, as *T. Aquinas part* 3. *qu. art.* 2. ſaith, *Peccatum contra Deum Commiſſum quandem infinitatam habet, infinitate Divinæ Majeſtatis.* That it is ſo is apparent by Gods threatning infinite puniſhment for every ſuch ſin, and by the common confeſſion of the Schoolmen, *&c.*

Now 'tis impoſſible that by a quality of but a finite Virtue and Dignity, an offence of infinite Indignity ſhould be blotted out, or compenſated and ſatisfied for. Bp. *D.* p. 350.

XXXVI.

XXXVI.

If Inherent Righteouſneſs be the Formal cauſe of Juſtification; then it expelleth the contrary Forme, *viz.* Inherent Sin, at its firſt coming, and at the firſt informing of its ſubject. This Propoſition is not only granted by the Papiſts, (*Vaſquez* and others) but laid as a great Foundation. But Inherent Righteouſneſs cannot do that. Witneſs *Iſa.* 64.6. *We are all as an unclean thing, and our Righteouſneſs as filthy raggs*, &c. *Job* 9. 30, 31. *Dan.* 9. 7. *Ezek.* 9. 15. All theſe were indowed with with Inherent Grace, yet they all own themſelves to be ſpotted with ſin.

XXXVII.

He that is formally juſtified by Inherent Righteouſneſs, from the time he he hath attained that quality is acceptable to God, and worthy of eternal life by vertue of that quality, without the ſupervening Grace of God, and Imputation of the Merits of Chriſt. For according to the Papiſts, the Formal cauſe of Juſtification, from the nature of the thing, doth abſolutely make us acceptable to God, and worthy of Heaven. But certain it is, that we do ſtand accepted with God, and to eternal happineſs, not by the efficacy, dignity, and vertue of this infuſed quality, but by the Merit of the Mediator. For if it be enquired, how we come to be received as the Children of God, the Scripture anſwereth, by, and for Chriſt: not by, and for the Sanctity that is beſtowed upon us. *Gal.* 4. 4. *God ſent his Son*

that

that he might Redeem thoſe that are under the Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons. And becauſe ye are Sons he hath ſent the ſpirit of his Son into your hearts. He do's not ſay Ye are received for Sons, becauſe the Spirit hath impreſt Inherent Holineſs upon you; but *e contra.* So that *Inherent Holineſs* is not the cauſe of Sonſhip, but the Conſequent. Again, If it be enquired why we are accepted with God to eternal life; the Scripture anſwereth, not by our *Inherent* Righteouſneſs, but by the favour of God in Chriſt our Mediator *Rom.* 5. 9. *Being juſtified by his bloud, we ſhall be delivered from wrath by him.* Alſo, *Rom.* 6. 32. *The Gift of God is Eternal Life by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* (not by Inherent Righteouſneſs, but by Chriſt, Bp. *D.* p. 352, 353.)

XXXVIII.

Chriſt reſigneth to no Creature the proper Works of a *Mediator*: Therefore he doth not confer upon *Inherent* Righteouſneſs, that that ſhould take away our ſins, ſhould reconcile us to God, ſhould render us accepted to eternal life, and conſequently he hath not made that to be the *Formal cauſe* of our Juſtification.

XXXIX.

The Formal cauſe of Juſtification ought to be ſuch, as to which a Believer may ſafely, and boldly commit himſelf in trouble of Conſcience, and in the Agony of Death. But none of the Papiſts have dared to truſt to their own Righteouſneſs, when under ſerious Temptations, when Con-

Conſcience was ſtruck with a true ſenſe of ſin, and of the Wrath of God, and ſnatcht, as it were, before the Tribunal of God. See B. *Downam* p. 202, 205. By which it appeareth that the Papiſts themſelves, when under the expectations of death, or trouble of Conſcience, are more Orthodox, than Mr. *Sh.* now is, in the point of Juſtification.

XL.

He is not juſtified by his own Inherent Righteouſneſs who ſtands juſtified by that that he receiveth from God daily the pardon of his unrighteouſneſs. But we do all ſin daily, and daily ask the forgiveneſs of ſin: Therefore we acknowledge that we do not ſtand juſtified, or worthy of Heaven, by a quality of Righteouſneſs *Inherent* in us; but that by the Remiſſion of ſins, and favor of God, life eternal is given to us, who are moſt unworthy, for Chriſts ſake.

XLI.

If the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt be the *Matter*, or *Material* cauſe of Juſtification, then the *Imputation* thereof is the *Form*, or *Formal* cauſe thereof. But the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the *Matter* of our Juſtification. By the *Matter* of our Juſtification, I mean that Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified; I ſay if it be ſo, then *Imputation*, or the *Imputing* of that Righteouſneſs muſt be the *Forme*: For it is the way, and manner in which we are juſtified, or whereby the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt comes to be as uſeful to us, for matter of Juſtification; as if it were

an internal, inherently formal Righteouſneſs, which were in ſtrictneſs of ſpeaking, that form whereby we were made juſt, or Righteous. Now that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the *Material Cauſe* of our Juſtification, I prove by the enſuing Arguments

1. The Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified is God's Righteouſneſs, not ours, *Rom.* 1. 17. *Rom.* 3. 21. The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt which is out of us in him is God's Righteouſneſs, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. 2 *Pet.* 1. 2. that which is inherent in us is ours: therefore we are juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which is out of us in him, and not by that which is inherent in our ſelves. Now in *Rom.* 4. 3. There is ſuch an oppoſition made betwixt God's Righteouſneſs and ours, in the point of Jmſtification; that whoſoever ſeek to be juſtified by their own Righteouſneſs, cannot be juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of God. Bp. *D.* p. 127, 128.

2. That is the *matter* of our Juſtification before God, by which we being ſinners in our ſelves do ſtand righteous before God, which we being ſinners may oppoſe to the Judgment of God, why he ſhould not condemn us, which we may plead as a full ſatisfaction to God for us: ſuch is the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. For being ſinners in our ſelves, yet believing in Chriſt, we are in him accepted, and conſtituted Righteous, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Rom.* 5. 19.

3. By that Righteouſneſs of man which only is *perfect* we are juſtified, and not by that which is *imperfect*. The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which

is

is out of us in him, is the only Righteouſneſs of man which is *perfect*, and all our inherent Righterouſneſs in this life is *imperfect*. *Ergo.* The Propoſition needeth no proof; for that Juſtice which is not perfect cannot ſtand in judgment before God, and is ſo far from juſtifying, that it ſelf is ſinful, every imperfection, and defect, being ἀνομία, a tranſgreſſion of the Law, and conſequently a ſin. *Auguſtin* ſaith, *Peccatum eſt cum charitas minor eſt quam debet.*

4. By that Righteouſneſs alone, and by no other we are juſtified, by which the Law is fully ſatisfied, and not by any Righteouſneſs inherent in us, or performed by us. Therefore we are juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt alone, and not by any Righteouſneſs *inherent* in us, or performed by us. Three things are here to be acknowledged. Firſt, That whoſoever is juſtified, is made juſt by ſome Righteouſneſs; for to think a man ſhould be juſtified without juſtice, is as abſurd as to think a man is cloathed without apparel.

Secondly, That all true Righteouſneſs is conformity to the Law of God, which is that perfect Rule of Righteouſneſs.

Thirdly, That there can be no Juſtification without the Law be ſatisfied, either by our ſelves, or by another for us, *Mat.* 5. 17. *Rom.* 3. 31. Now by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt the Law is fully ſatisfied; but by any other Righteouſneeſs inherent in us, or performed by us, the Law neither is, nor can be fully ſatisfied.

5. By what Righteouſneſs we are *abſolved*, *redeem-*

redeemed, Reconciled; and for which we ſhall be *ſaved*, by it we are juſtified. But by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt alone, we are *abſolved* from our ſins, *redeemed* from our iniquities, *reconciled* to God, and ſhall be *ſaved*. *Ergo*, The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the *matter* of our Righteouſneſs beforeGod, or the only Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified. To prove the *Major*, read *Rom.* 4. 5, 6, 7, 8. where *Juſtification* and *Remiſſion*, *or Abſolution* are ſpoken of promiſcuouſly.

Again the benefit of Redemption is explained by *Remiſſion* of ſin, *Eph.* 1. 7. *Col.* 1. 14. *Titus* 2. 14. *Pſal.* 133. 8

Again, Being reconciled to God, and being juſtified are uſed promiſcuouſly, *Rom.* 5. 9, 10. 2 *Cor.* 5. 14.

Again, Salvation, and Juſtification, are put one for the other; for that which is the *Matter* of Juſtification, is the *merit* of Salvation: for by what we are juſtified, by that we are intituled to Salvation; and by what we receive remiſſion of ſins, by that alſo we receive our Inheritance. Juſtification may be compared to the *Inſtitution* of a Miniſter to a Benefice, which giveth *Jus ad rem* Glorification to *Induction*, which giveth *Jus in re*, or poſſeſſion, *&c.*

6. The Righteouſneſs of God by which we are juſtified is not preſcribed in the Law to Juſtification, but without the Law is revealed in the Goſpel, *Rom.* 3. 21. Therefore not inherent Righteouſneſs, but that is the matter of our Juſtification: for the Righteouſneſs of God is

not

not preſcribed in the Law to juſtiefication, but *Inherent* Righteovſneſs is, this being the great difference betwixt the Law, and the Goſpel, that the Law to Juſtification requireth perfect Obedience to be performed in our own perſons: The Goſpel propoundeth the Obedience of Chriſt, which he performed for us to be accepted in their behalf who believe in him. Wherefore (ſaith Bp. *D.* p. 200. alluding to *Gal.* 1. 8, 9.) *Let him be held accurſed, though he were an Apoſtle, though an Angel from Heaven, who ſhall teach Juſtification by the Legal Righteouſneſs, and not by the Evangelical.*

7. The matter of our Righteouſneſs before God, as it is not *only* not our Inherent Righteouſneſs, ſo neither is it that in part: For we are not juſtified before God, both by Faith and by Works, by Gods Righteouſneſs and our own, by that Righteouſneſs which is out of Chriſt in us, and that which is inherent in our ſelves: For the Scripture maketh ſuch an oppoſition betwixt theſe two, as that they cannot ſtand together, *Rom.* 3 28. *Rom.* 4. 4, 5. 9. 3, 31, 32. 11. 5, 6. *Phil.* 3. 9. *Gal.* 2. 16. 3. 11. *Eph.* 2. 8, 9. *Ergo.* The only matter of our Juſtification is the Righteouſneſs, or Obedience of Chriſt, *Rom.* 5. 9, 19.

8. An Imputative, not an Inherent righteouſneſs is the matter of our Juſtification, and therefore the righteouſdeſs of Chriſt is it. For proof of that matter, ſee *Rom.* 5. 19. where it is called the *Righteouſneſs of one, whereas if it were a Righteouſneſs from him in us, it would be the Juſtice of ſo many as are juſtified,* as the *Councel of Trent* ſpeak-

eth,

eth, *Juſtitiam in nobis recipientes unusquiſque ſuam.*

9. That Juſtification which the Scripture teacheth taketh away all manner of boaſting, *Rom*, 3. 27. *Eph.* 2. 9. But the owning of Chriſt his righteouſneſs for the only matter of our Juſtification, only taketh away boaſting. Therefore that is, and ought to be ſo owned. They that make as if our ſincere Obedience were the matter of our Juſtification, do ſpeak as if the *Covenant of Grace*, and the other *of Works*, did differ only *gradu not Specie* and both did yield matter of boaſting, only the *Covenant of Grace*, the leſs of the two.

10. The Righteouſneſs whereby *Abraham*, *David*, and *Paul*, were juſtified, was the righteouſneſs of Chriſt: Therefore that is the only matter of our righteouſneſs before God, or the only righteouſneſs whereby we can be juſtified, *Rom.* 4. 3, 4, 5, 23, 24. *Pſal.* 143. 2. *Pſal.* 71. 16. 1 *Cor* 4. 4. *Phil.* 3. 8, 9. To theſe we might add *Job*, *Eſay*, and *Daniel*, *Job* 9. 2, 3. 15. 20. 10. 15. 42. 6. *Iſa.* 6. 1, 5. *Dan.* 6. 7, 18.

11. What righteouſneſs God accepteth on our behalf by that we are juſtified: the righteouſneſs of Chriſt which he performed for us in his fleſh, God accepteth on our behalf. *Ergo.* By that we are Juſtified, or *that is* the matter of our Juſtification. *This very Argument* Bellarmin *uſeth againſt* Oſiander, *De Juſtif.* lib. 2. cap. 5. *Otherwiſe* (ſaith he) *Why did the Son of God take our fleſh upon him, why became he obedient unto death?* &c.

12. Only a righteouſneſs of infinite value, can be

be a ſatisfaction for ſin (ſo *Bellarmin* himſelf ſaith in the ſame place) Such is the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt only in regard of the dignity of his Perſon, &c. *Ergo.* The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt only can be the matter of our Righteouſneſs before God.

13. The Scripture ſpeaks of our Righteouſneſs being in Chriſt, and of our being Righteous in him, or of Chriſt being our Righteouſneſs. *Ergo. Iſa.* 45. 24, 25. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Phil.* 3. 8, 9. *Jer.* 23. 6. *Jer.* 33. 16. 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. Theſe Texts Bp. *Downam* hath for imputed Righteouſneſs, which Mr. *Sherlock* rejects as nothing to that purpoſe. See Bp. *Downam*, p. 224. *Bellarmin* himſelf confeſſeth, *that Chriſt is called our Righteouſneſs, becauſe he ſatisfied his Father for us, which his Satisfaction* he doth ſo give and communicate *to us when he doth juſtifie us that it may be called our Satisfaction and our Righteouſneſs. This Confeſſion diſſolveth* the very frame of his whole Doctrine of Juſtification: whereunto he hath taught that nothing concurreth but Deletion of ſin, and Infuſion of Righteouſneſs, which they ſay expelleth ſin, &c. As for Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, he, and his followers deride and ſcorn it. *But* here *he confeſſeth, that in Juſtification the Satisfaction of Chriſt is imputed to us and accepted of God in our behalf, as if we our ſelves had ſatisfied God,* and *that for that cauſe he is truly called our Righteouſneſs.* How much more *Orthodox is* Bellarmin *here than Mr.* Sherlock?

14. We are juſtified by the Blood of Chriſt;

Rom. 5. 19. Therefore the Obedience of Chriſt, even to Death, is the matter of our Juſtification.

15. By the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt our ſins are *covered as by a Garment*, *Ergo.* That is the matter of our Juſtification, *Pſal.* 32. 1. For he is juſtified whoſe ſins are covered. See Bp. *Downam*, p. 226. ſaith he, *Bellarmin confeſſeth that the ſimilitude*, and the Example of *Jacob* may be accommodated to imputed Righteouſneſs, which Similitude Mr. *Sh.* ſcoffs at, &c.

N. B. Bellarmin would perſwade the world that we are ſo abſurd, as to teach that we are formally made juſt by the Righteouſneſs of another; but (ſaith Bp. *Downam*) we are well content that the Righteouſneſs whereby we are Sanctified, or formally made Righteous ſhould not be *Imputative*, ſo that they will confeſs that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt his whole Satisfaction, whereby we are juſtified before God is imputed to us, *which they muſt confeſs, or elſe they cannot be ſaved*, p. 227. Thus far he, &c.

XLII.

Whereas it may be enquired whether the *Active*, or *Paſſive* Obedience of Chriſt, or both together, be the *matter* of our Juſtification, and the Imputation thereof the *Form*: I Anſwer, that the *Active*, and *Paſſive* Obedience of Chriſt, are both in a ſenſe, and to a degree, imputed to Believers, though not in ſo large a ſenſe, as ſome have ſaid, *viz.* as if Believers were reckoned

oned by Chriſt their Surety to have done whatſoever Chriſt himſelf did, *viz.* to have fulfilled all Righteouſneſs, neither to have committed any thing which they ought not to have done, nor to have omitted any thing which they ought to have done: Or, as if Believers in Chriſt might have been ſaid to have done whatſoever he did in the Fleſh, or Chriſt to have done every thing that he did in their ſtead, room, and behalf, and as it were for them.

For whatſoever Jeſus Chriſt was bound, as Man, by the Law of Creation, to do for himſelf, *Ex. gr.* to love God with all his heart, &c. he could not be ſaid to have done for others (ſo as he is ſaid to have ſuffered for us) or Believers to have done, in, and by him: For as Chriſt could not have made atonement for our ſins if he had any ſin of his own, *Heb.* 7. 27. *Such a High-Prieſt became us who needed not daily as thoſe High-Prieſts to Offer up ſacrifice firſt for his own ſin, and then for the People's*, &c. So what Duty and obſervance Chriſt had to pay for himſelf, he could not be ſaid to have preſented to God upon our account, or we to have fulfilled theſe things in him, *Ex. gr.* That we in Chriſt did love God, truſt in God, delight to do the Will of God, or that foraſmuch as he did it we may be ſaid to have done it alſo. That I ſay is not true. Were that true, that Chriſt had done every thing that the Law of God requires that Believers ſhould do, or ſhould ever have done; and that upon their account, that they in, and by him might have been reckoned to have

kept the whole Law of God perfectly, and God to have accepted of his Active Obedience, instead of theirs, two things would follow, *viz.*

1. Then there were no need of the *Passive* Obedience or sufferings of Christ on our behalf, sith believers might plead not guilty to the whole Law of God, upon the account of having compleatly answered to every tittle thereof, by Christ their Surety, who was appointed of God to Officiate in their stead.

2. Neither then would it be needful for us to keep the Law of God, to our power in our own Persons sith it had been kept, and observed for us by way of proxy, allowed of God for that purpose. To be sure it would be unjust for God to punish us for not observing his Law our selves, so long as it was punctually observed by Christ, whom himself (according to that Opinion) did admit, and allow of, to keep, and observe it upon our account. He who hath his place excellently well Officiated and supplyed by an able Proxy, allowed, and admitted to Officiate for him, is no more to be blam'd, or kept from his reward, than if he had serv'd it in his own Person. But both these are great inconveniencies and absurdities, *viz.* either to say that we are not bound, upon pain of damnation, unto obeying the Gospel of Christ, and keeping the Laws of God in our own Person, (which is the thing called Holiness, without which no Man shall see God:) Or else to say that Christ dyed in vain, or that the *Passive* Obedi-

obedience of our Saviour was needleſs, and ſuperfluous, as it would have been, if Chriſt his active obedience had been ſo reckoned, and imputed to us, that we ſhould be accounted of God to have done whatſoever he did, *i. e.* to have fulfill'd all righteouſneſs actually, and actively, *&c.*

LXIII.

Yet nevertheleſs Jeſus Chriſt his conformity to the whole Law of God, or being made under the Law, conſider it as a part of his *Humiliation*, and Exinanition, was certainly one part, and degree of the *Satisfaction*, which he made to the Juſtice of God for Believers. For though it behoved Chriſt when he became man, and dwelt amongſt men, to have been conformable to the Law of his Creation, it doth not follow that by that his conformity to the Law he did no way ſatisfie for us. For if any man being free, and *ſui juris*, do oblige himſelf not only to die, on the behalf of another, but to ſerve a hard Apprentiſhip firſt, may he not be ſaid to make ſatisfaction in part, as well by the hard ſervice which he undergoes, as by dying for him at the expiration of ſuch a time of ſervitude? For though he were bound upon pain of preſent death, to ſuch acts of ſervitude, or ſlavery, after that he had taken that condition upon him, yet foraſmuch as he was not bound to have taken upon him the condition of a ſlave, or ſervant, but that it was his free will, and pleaſure, ſo to do, in order to ſatisfying the debt, or of-

fence of another perſon: I ſay, in that regard, his ſo doing could not be ſaid to be the paying of one debt with another. A *Surety* when he has taken upon him that relation is bound to pay the whole debt, if the Principal debtor faileth; do's it therefore follow, that becauſe it belongs to him, in that caſe, as he is a Surety, to pay the debt, that therefore his payment is not ſatisfactory, or that it is but the paying of one debt with another? *viz.* the debt of his friend, with the debt of his *ſuretiſhip*, or of his relation as a Surety? Foraſmuch as he was voluntarily a Surety, in order to freeing, or ſatisfying ſuch a debt (which he needed not to have been) his paiment is good, for another, *&c.*

XLIV.

Chriſt did ſome things which did not belong to him to do meerly as he was a *man*, nor yet as he was of ſuch a nation, *viz.* a *Jew*, but did belong only to ſinful men, as ſuch, to do, *viz.* he ſuffered himſelf to be *Circumciſed*, and *Oblations* to be offered for him, *Luke* 2. 21, 24. he was conformable to ſeveral other Ceremonial Laws, *John* 7. 2, 10. *Mat.* 26. 17. He was baptized, and he ſeems to have eaten the Lord's Supper with his Diſciples. And he calls theſe works the fulfilling of Righteouſneſs. Now theſe things were not abſolutely neceſſary to conſtitute the Sanctity, Juſtice, and purity of Chriſt, or by the Law of his Creation. To thoſe things therefore Chriſt ſeems to have been bound meerly by a peculiar compact with his Father, partly

in

in order to his greater *Humiliation*, and partly in order to the better promoting of our Salvation. Moreover, thoſe obſervances, though they were not abſolutely neceſſary to the holyneſs of Chriſt, or of any man, antecedently to the command of God injoyning, and impoſing them, yet conſequently upon that they were, as was the poſitive Law of abſtaining from the *Tree of the knowledg of good and and evil*. And though thoſe outward obſervances, ſeparated from inward Sanctity, are but the bark or ſhell of Religion, which God makes nothing of, *Iſa.* 1.12, *&c.* 66.3. yet as performed by him, who was God, and conſequently a great branch, and ſign of humiliation, and ſubjection, they cannot but be of great merit, and conduce much to promote that ſatisfaction which he undertoook for believers, *&c.* Yet foraſmuch as Chriſtians now a days are not bound to ſome of theſe obſervances, *ex gr.* to Circumciſion, to Sacrifices, *&c.* and as for other of them, they are bound to obſerve them in their own perſons, as namely *Baptiſm*, and the *Lords Supper*, &c. that kind of Obedience cannot be ſaid to have been, or to be imputed to believers, in any ſuch ſtrict ſenſe, as if Chriſt had performed it in their place, and ſteed: yet it muſt be ſaid, that that part of Chriſts obedience was accepted of God as a part of that λυτρον, or price of Redemption, which was due for our ſins, and ſo far forth, or in that looſer ſenſe, imputed.

XLV.

Christ's submitting himself to a mean condition, as *taking upon him the form of a servant, and making himself of no reputation*, were not Essential to the purity of his nature, or necessary in order to his own Salvation (who being God could not miscarry) but were a part of God's Curse due for sin, and necessary to promote the Salvation of Believers. Therefore these things were a part of Christs *Satisfaction*, which is after a sort imputed to us for righteousness; but not in such manner as if Christ had taken these things upon him in our place, and steed, for neither are we thereby made free from that kind of life, *viz.* from servitude, and meaness; nor are we bonnd to govern our own lives according to that pattern, and as many are tied to any such thing, are tied thereto, in their own person, I say to undergo it (say it be the condition of meer servants) in their own persons, and not by Christ their *Surety*.

XLVI.

It may be of great use to understand aright, & to bear in mind what is the true notion of *Imputation*, or what the word *Imputed* meaneth. Imputation (therefore) is the Acceptation of (*Numb.* 18. 26, 30.) one thing for another. He is righteous, or just by *Imputation*, who being in himself guilty of a fault, yet is accounted righteous, or *guiltless*, for the sake of something else which is admitted, or accepted, in the place, or steed of that justice,

juſtice, or righteouſneſs, which ought to have been inherent in himſelf. The thing ſo accepted is called *Imputed Righteouſneſs*. And it is ſo called becauſe it is a righteous thing, to give, and take ſatisfaction, or compenſation, for ſin committed, *Him God hath held forth for a propitiation that God might be juſt, &c.* If this juſtice, or righteouſneſs be full and adequate to the fault committed, it removeth the deſert of puniſhment from the guilty, and extinguiſheth all obligation therunto. The Juſtification of a perſon not inherently juſt, but guilty, is when the fault of which the party is accuſed is acknowledged; but ſomething elſe is tendered, or pleaded for it, by which he may be vindicated from the merit of condemnation. Nor can any other way be found out whereby a guilty perſon may be juſtified, *&c.* when the deſert of condemnation is removed, the fault it ſelf is after a ſort extinguiſhed, as if it had never been committed, *&c.* Vide *Bradſhaw, de Juſtif.* cap. 5.

XLVII.

After all that has been ſaid touching the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, its being the *Material cauſe* of our Juſtification, and the Imputation thereof, the *Form* or *Formal cauſe* of our Juſtification; I muſt needs own it for a truth, that Believers are in Scripture frequently denominated juſt, or righteous perſons, from that righteouſneſs, or holineſs which is inherent in them: yea, it cannot be denied but by vertue thereof they are formally juſt, and righteous, though but with an im-

imperfect righteouſneſs, &c. *Luke* 1.6. 'Tis ſaid of *Zachary*, and *Elizabeth*, *They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments of God blameleſsly*, Iſa. 38. 3. *Remember, O Lord*, ſaid *Hezekiah*, &c. So we read of righteous *Abel*, Mat. 23. 35. *and that the righteous ſhall go into life eternal.* 1 Joh. 3. 7. *He that doth righteouſneſs is righteous.* So it is ſaid of *Job*, ch. 1. 1. that *he was an upright*, i. e. *a right, or righteous man, one that feared God, and eſchewed evil.* Neither is this at all to the prejudice of the Doctrine of Juſtification, only by, and for the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us. For it is one thing to be righteous with an inherent, habitual, imperfect righteouſneſs, which may ſerve for ſome other good uſes, and purpoſes; as namely, to glorifie God, and adorn the Goſpel, to do ſome good therewith to our ſelves, and others; and another thing to be righteous with a compleat, perfect righteouſneſs, whereby we are free'd from the Curſe, or Condemning power of the Law, and have right and title given us to eternal life; foraſmuch as all our ſins, as well of *Omiſſion*, as *Commiſſion*, are ſatisfied for by Chriſt: and the believer thereupon is left no more liable to puniſhment either of *Senſe*, or *Loſs*, that is, either to Hell, or to the miſſing of Heaven; than if he had in his own perſon made God a plenary amends for all the injury which he had done him. From inherent righteouſneſs, a man is reckoned by God, as righteous only to ſuch a degree, (as we call School-boys *Scholars*, becauſe they have ſome little learning, but not enough

to fit them for the Univerſity, or whereby to claim a degree there.) So holy men from that imperfect righteouſneſs which they have by Gods gracious condeſcention, are termed juſt, or righteous, but not with a righteouſneſs which renders them altogether guiltleſs, and faultleſs in the ſight of God, as doth that righteouſneſs whereby they are juſtified. Therefore from their inherent righteouſneſs, though good men are denominated *juſt*, yet they are not from thence ordinarily denominated *juſtified*, nor at all but in a leſs ſtrict, and proper ſenſe.

XLVIII.

As for the danger of the Doctrine of Juſtification by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to Believers in point of debauching the lives of men, they are worſe ſcar'd than hurt, who dream of any ſuch thing: For firſt, They who preach that Doctrine, do conſtantly teach, that whomſoever God juſtifieth, he ſanctifies at the ſame time, and that that faith which is the inſtrument of their juſtification, is always ſuch as doth purifie their hearts, produce good works, work by love, and that which doth not is a dead faith, and conſeqnently, that *no unrighteous perſon* (becauſe every ſuch perſon is void of true faith) *ſhall inherit the Kingdome of God.* They tell the people that they ſhall as certainly be damned if they live and die without holyneſs, and good works, as if men were to be ſaved by a righteouſneſs inherent in themſelves. Again, They tell them, that men *who by patient continu-*

ance

ance in well doing, do ſeek life and glory, ſhall as certainly be ſaved, as if their ſo doing were truly meritorious; yea a valuable price, or purchaſe, of ſalvation; or as if they might claim, and challenge heaven for ſo doing, though when all is done, they muſt confeſs themſelves to have been unprofitable ſervants, and that eternal life is the *free gift of God through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord*. Who then can ſay more, in effect, either to deter men from the commiſſion of ſin by the danger of hell fire it ſelf, or to encourage men to the practice of true Religion: mean time preſerving the honor of the free grace of God in Jeſus Chriſt? In this behalf the oppoſers of *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, deal as diſingeniouſly, and ſlanderouſly, with thoſe of the other perſwaſion, as the *Papiſts* do againſt the *Proteſtants*, in all whoſe accuſations of that nature, as to the generality of Orthodox Proteſtants, there is not one word of truth. For neither do they who contend earneſtly for Juſtification only by Chriſts righteouſneſs imputed to us, ſet at naught holineſs, as a needleſs thing, and that without which men may be ſaved by Chriſt: neither can any ſuch inference be with any colour of reaſon, drawn from their opinion, as touching the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt being the only *Material*, and the *Imputation* of that Righteouſneſs, the only *Formal* cauſe of Juſtification.

Is it not enough that they do all own inherent righteouſneſs, or Holineſs, to be *cauſa ſine qua non* of Juſtification, and Salvation? As he that hath a great ſum of money owing him (admit

a thouſand pounds) cannot receive it unleſs he will give him that is to pay it an *Acquittance*, no more than if it were not due to him, though his owing of the money is the only cauſe why he is content to pay it, not becauſe he to whom he ſhould pay it, will give him a Note to ſhew for ſo much received, for had he not owed it he would have cared for no ſuch Note, nor have payed ſuch a ſum, to have received a Million of ſuch Notes as thoſe, &c.

What Creditor do's not hold himſelf as much concerned to give an Acquittance, when demanded, in order to receiving a great ſum of mony, that is due to him, becauſe without ſo doing he cannot receive it, as if he had no other right to it, or it were not due to him upon any other account?

XLIX.

Before I come to treat of the *Inſtrumental Cauſe* of Juſtification, which is *Faith* alone, it may be neceſſary to aſſign the reaſon, or cauſes why I have placed Juſtification not in the *Remiſſion of ſins*, as ſome do; but in God's *accounting*, *eſteeming*, and *pronouncing* a Believing ſinner righteous to Eternal Life; I ſay, There are ſufficient reaſons to be given why Juſtification ſhould be placed *not in Remiſſion of ſin*, but in *accounting*, and *declaring*, the juſtified Perſon righteous.

L.

To pardon an Offence is, in ſtrictneſs of ſpeaking, nothing elſe but to remit the puniſhment of it, or not to puniſh it; as when a Malefactor worthy of Death, or Baniſhment, and Sentenced thereunto, hath that Sentence reverſed, or taken off, but is not intituled to any reward, or priviledge. But to juſtifie a ſinner is not only to take off the Sentence of damnation that did lye againſt him (as the Scripture ſaith, *He that believeth not is condemned already*,) but by accounting and making him ſavingly righteous to give him right, and title to Eternal Life. Now, to reward (eſpecially with ſo great a reward as Heaven, or to intitle a Man thereunto) is much more than not to puniſh him with Hell, and Eternal Death.

LI.

Yet I ſhall not lay very much ſtreſs upon that firſt Argument, becauſe it may be ſaid that the puniſhment due to ſinners conſiſts not only in the miſeries, and torments of Hell, but alſo in the loſs of Heaven; ſo that if the whole puniſhment be taken away, (or which is all one, the ſinner fully pardoned) he is by means thereof reſtored to a right and Title to Eternal Life. As if a Father who has declared that he will not only beat his Son, for ſome great Offence, but alſo diſinherit him, ſhall pardon him, to all intents, and purpoſes; his ſo doing muſt extend not only to the not beating of him,

him, but alſo unto the owning, and accepting of him for his Heir, or re-inſtating him into his Inheritance.

LII.

Therefore in Order to proving that Juſtification doth not conſiſt in *remiſſion of ſins*, I ſhall rather truſt to theſe (and ſome following) Arguments. Firſt, If whereſoever in the Scripture we find the word *Juſtifie* inſtead thereof we ſhould put *Pardon*, where *Juſtification*, *Pardoning*, where *Juſtified*, *Pardoned*; the notion, or conſtruction thence ariſing will be found ſenſeleſs, and abſurd, then to *Juſtifie* in the Language of Scripture (which muſt be adhered to, and muſt decide this controverſie) is one thing, and to *Pardon* is another, *Juſtification* one thing, and *Pardon of ſin* another. But ſo it is, witneſs theſe Inſtances, beſides many more which might be alledged, *Deut.* 25. 1. *They ſhall pardon* (inſtead of juſtifie) *the guiltleſs, and condemn the wicked.* Pſal. 51. 4. *That thou mayſt be pardoned when thou judgeſt*, Mat. 11. 19. *Wiſdom is pardoned of her Children*, 1 Tim. 4. 16. *Pardoned in the Spirit.*

If a Man Examine all the places in *Moſes and the Prophets*, where the term of *Juſtification* is uſed, he ſhall find none where *pardon* of ſin is thereby ſignified. *Vide Gataker*, p. 13.

LIII.

A Man may be *Pardoned*, and yet not *Juſtified*; or *Juſtified*, amongſt Men, and not *Pardoned*,

Pardoned, Ergo. juſtification, and *pardon* are two diſtinct things. For it is an undoubted Axiom; *Quæ ſubjecto differunt inter ſe differunt. Thoſe things that differ in ſubject*, that is, the one whereof may be found in ſome Subject where the other is not, are diſtinct, and divers one from another. Now, *remiſſion* may be where *juſtification* is not; and *juſtification* may be where *remiſſion* is not. If a Man have wronged me, I may forgive him, as *David* did *Shimei*, and yet not *juſtifie* him in his dealings. And when a Man is falſly accuſed of wrong done to another, then he may be juſtified and yet nothing *remitted*, becauſe no wrong at all done. So we are ſaid to *juſtifie God*, Pſal. 51.4.

Though in regard of a man's State, God never remits ſin where he do's not *juſtifie*; yet in regard of ſome particular *acts*, he remits ſin ſometimes where he juſtifies not, *Pſal.* 78. 37, 38. *Though their hearts were not upright with him, yet even of his compaſſion he forgave their iniquity, and deſtroyed them not.* So far forth remitted it as not inſtantly to deſtroy them for it. And ſometimes God *juſtifies* when he *remits* not, as he did in approving *Phineas* his Act, as a juſt and righteous Act, *Pſal.* 106. 30, 31. And as he is ſaid to juſtifie the Prophet *Eſay*, in the diſcharge of his Miniſtry, *Eſay* 50. 8. If a Man that hath wronged another do obtain his *Pardon* without giving him real Satisfaction, in caſe he be queſtioned for it another time, he may plead his *Pardon*, but not ſtand upon his *juſtification*. But if he has given him full Satisfaction by himſelf,

or

or Surety, he may ſtand upon his Juſtification, and plead not guilty, becauſe he can plead *ſatisfaction* made, and accepted. And this latter, not the former, is the very caſe betwixt God, and Man in the juſtifying of a ſinner: Satisfaction is the main ground of the Juſtification of him, not made by him, but by Chriſt for him. To this point *Bellarmin*, *de juſtif.* l. 1. c. 2. Speaks as well as any Proteſtant, and far beyond the *Socinians*; *vide* Gataker, p. 14, 15, 16.

LIV.

Juſtification is the cauſe of *Remiſſion* of ſins, and *Remiſſion* of ſins is the proper effect of *Juſtification*; therefore thoſe two things muſt needs be different, and diſtinct. To pardon an Offender is not to puniſh him, or to exempt him from all manner of puniſhment due to him for ſuch an Offence (whether it be puniſhment of ſenſe, or of loſs) And the reaſon why God doth forbear to puniſh a ſinner, is, becauſe he looks upon him as a guiltleſs Perſon, for as much as he hath ſatisfied for his Offences, by his Surety Jeſus Chriſt. *Guilt* is our Obligation to puniſhment, but when full Satisfaction is rendered, and accepted, there remains no more Obligation to puniſhment. And therefore it is that God doth look upon a Believer as guiltleſs, with reference to eternal puniſhments (which are by Chriſt ſatisfied for) and thereupon forbeareth for ever to inflict any ſuch puniſhment upon, or denounce it againſt him. Whence it appeareth that *Pardon* of ſin is the effect of Juſti-

 fication,

fication, and consequently, is after it, *ordine naturæ*, though not *temporis*, and so cannot be the same thing.

L V.

To pardon an Offender may be an Act of meer *Favour*, and *Mercy*, and doth most properly signifie the forgiveness, which is without Satisfaction. But for God to justifie a Believing Sinner is an Act of *Justice*. God's Justice doth as well appear in acquitting us for Christ, as in exacting a payment for us from Christ, *Isa.* 53. 7. Justice in Civil Courts consists as well in acquitting the Guiltless, as in condemning the Guilty, *Deut.* 25. 1. The Justification of a sinner is transacted not by a meer Sovereign, and absolute Power alone, but in a Legal way; whence it is the Apostle saith, that *the Law is not thereby infringed, but established*, Rom. 3. 31. For Christ in the Scripture is termed not only μεσίτης, a *Mediator*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. or one that by perswasion, and interest indeavours to compose the difference between them, but he is said to be also ἔγγυος a Surety, *viz.* as God's Surety to Man for the performance of his promises which are *all in Christ, yea and Amen*, 2 Cor. 1. 20. *So Man's Surety to God for the discharge of the debt of all* those that have interest in him, and making satisfaction to God by doing, and induring whatsoever was necessary for that purpose, *Esay* 53. 6. *We all had strayed, and the Lord had caused the iniquity of us all to remain on him.* It was *exacted* (as *Junius* rightly renders

ders it) and he *answered*, that is, engag'd himself for the Discharge of it, as *Cappel* well renders the word, yea, he did really answer it, as we say of a party, or *Surety* that hath made payment, that *he hath answered the Debt*; *vide* Gataker, p. 27, 28.

LVI.

That God is said to pardon, or forgive those whom he justifieth; though he has received satisfaction for their Offences, is made a proper kind of speaking, and a true notion, for that he exempts them from punishment, as they do who pardon others, and not only so, but exerteth as much of Grace, and Mercy, towards the justified Person in the manner of doing it, as if he had remitted his Offences without any satisfaction given, or demanded. Hence, saith *Bernard*, *vide Gataker*, p. 23, 24. *Thou art saved by nothing, but not saved with nothing, for nothing* laid down by thee, but *not without a price pay'd by Christ.*

LVII.

The justifying of a Sinner is not meerly the accepting of him as savingly just, and Righteous, but the making of him so, *Rom.* 5. 18. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *It is not* (as one calls it) *the remitting of the penalty of the Law, and so discharging a guilty Person, as if he were innocent, and righteous, not according to Law and Justice, but out of a Sovereign and absolute Power. A Man who before was not just cannot truly be justified unless he*

firſt be made, or conſtituted juſt, Gataker 33. The word *Juſtifie* doth not ſignifie in common uſe to *make juſt*, yet a Man that hath done wrong that he may be juſtified, muſt be firſt made juſt, not inherently juſt, for though he were ſo, yet that would not be ſufficient to clear him from the guilt of his former unjuſt Act (as of theft, &c.) but he muſt be ſo made juſt, *i. e.* guiltleſs, and blameleſs, as that he may anſwer the rigor of Law and Juſtice, e're he can truly be juſtified, and this cannot be done but by a plenary ſatisfaction for the wrong done and the Offence formerly committed, exhibited, and accepted.

Now, that which is exhibited by doing, or ſuffering, or both, in way of Satisfaction, and ſo accepted, being ſuch as makes a plenary ſatisfaction for an Offence formerly committed, becauſe it utterly extinguiſheth, and aboliſheth the wrong, ſo taketh it away as if it had never been, it juſtly procures a guiltleſneſs, and blameleſneſs, to the Delinquent, in whoſe behalf it is performed, and makes him therefore to be reputed in the eye of the Law, and Juſtice, as therefore now no delinquent, but as guiltleſs, faultleſs, and juſt.

LVIII.

Mr. *Gataker*, p. 34. ſaith, that not the *Satisfaction* it's ſelf, but the *Guiltleſsneſs* thereby procured is that which is ſo often in Scripture termed, *Juſtice* or *Righteouſneſs* called the Righteouſneſs of God, *Rom.* 1. 17. & 3. 21, 22. & 2 *Cor.*

2 *Cor.* 5. 21. becauſe prepared propounded and appointed us by God (for God as the party wronged, and Chriſt as the party ſatisfying for this wrong, are in this Argument diſtinguiſhed, *Rom.* 3. 24, 25. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. 21.)

LIX.

The Juſtification ſpoken of in the Scripture is ſuch a Juſtification as wherein there is a ſpecial manifeſtation of God's *Juſtice*, Rom. 3. 26. whereas in ſuch caſe, which in plain terms is no other than meer pardon, there may be an ample declaration of *Mercy*, but no ſuch demonſtration of *Juſtice* at all.

LX.

They are miſtaken who ſay that the word δικαιοσύνη when applyed to *Juſtification*, doth ſignifie *moderation*, *equity*, *grace*, and *mercy*, in *pardon* of ſin; and that the word δικαιος imports only a *merciful*, *charitable* perſon, &c. *Vide* Gattaker, p. 24.

That the word δικαιος, or *Righteous* is uſed in the New Teſtament with an eye to Retributive Juſtice conſiſting in acquitting the guiltleſs, and doing Juſtice upon the guilty, may appear from the enſuing Texts, *viz.* *John* 7. 24. *John* 5. 30. *Rev.* 15. 3. *Rev.* 16. 5, 7. *Rev.* 19. 11. 1 *John* 2. 29. 2 *Tim.* 4. 8. Let *Grotius* and *Hammond* conſult their own Expoſitions on theſe Texts one of which doth Expreſly ſo Interpret, 2 *Tim.* 4. 8. though there not ſo neceſſarily, becauſe the alluſion is there to the Judges, or

Triers at the Olympick Games: Again, *Rom.* 1. 32. and *Rom.* 2. 5. where 'tis apparent that *Punitive Juſtice* is meant alſo, *Rom.* 3. 4, 5. expounded by the next words, *Is God unrighteous in taking vengeance?* *Rom.* 9. 28, 14. 2 *Theſ.* 1. 6. *Gattaker* 24, 25, 26, 27.

LXI.

Though as *Juſtifying* is ſometimes taken for approving, or vindicating an innocent perſon that is wrongfully accuſed, or approving a juſt action, as that of *Phineas*; I ſay, though as the word is taken in that ſenſe, God is ſaid to juſtifie when he do's not pardon; yet ſo as the word *juſtifie* is taken when God is ſaid to *juſtifie the ungodly*, Rom. 4. 5. (which is the uſual acceptation of it, and that which we here enquire after) God doth never *juſtifie* but he doth alſo *pardon*. Remiſſion of Sins is a neceſſary conſequent of efficacious Juſtification, grounded upon ſatisfaction tendered, and accepted, made, and admitted. When ſatisfaction for an injury is made and accepted, and the party that did it in reguard thereof juſtified, that is, thereby thereof diſcharged, Reaſon and equity requires that the offence be *remitted*, that is, that the party wronged ceaſe now to be offended with him whom he was juſtly offended with before. *Vide Gattaker* 23.

LXII.

Becauſe when God doth juſtifie a ſinner, he doth always pardon his ſins (as hath been ſaid) and

and Remiſſion of ſins, or exemption from puniſhment, or reverſing the ſentence of condemnation, are immediate effects, and conſequents of Juſtification: therefore it is that ſome excellent Divines have put *Remiſſion* of ſins into their deſcription of *Juſtification*, though certain it is, that they do differ as the *cauſe*, and the *effect*. For God doth therefore remit ſin, or take off the the penalty due for ſin, becauſe he juſtifies the ſinner, and do's own, and acknowledg him to be guiltleſs; that is, juſtly liable to no ſuch penalty, foraſmuch as the juſtice of God is by Chriſt ſatisfied for him, inaſmuch as he is a true believer. God doth not juſtifie men, becauſe he has pardoned them (as a Prince might do a man-ſlayer whom by his Prerogative he has pardoned) but becauſe he *Juſtifieth* them, or acknowledges them juſt and righteous upon account of the ſatisfaction which he has received from Chriſt on their behalf, therefore he pardoneth them, or exempteth them from puniſhment, *&c.*

LXIII.

Juſtification ſeemeth to waſh a ſinner cleaner, than bare *pardon* would have done; foraſmuch as *Juſtification* taketh away not only the *penalty* that was incurr'd by ſin, but the very *deſert* of that penalty, which *bare pardon* ſeemeth not to do. He who hath made full ſatisfaction for an offence, after that is done, is not worthy, or do's not deſerve to ſuffer for it, becauſe the crime is thereby extinguiſhed, and annihilated, but

he who has received only a free pardon (as for murther, or the like) though that is ſufficient to ſave his life, yet it cannot take away his *demerit*, or *deſert* to die, *&c.* Indeed every juſtified perſon before ſatisfaction accepted, and taking place in him, *i. e.* before he did believe, did deſerve to die eternally, till after the ſatisfaction of Chriſt applyed by faith, he can no longer be ſaid to be under the guilt, or juſt *demerit* of damnation, *&c.* Whereas *Ameſius* ſaith in his *Chap. de Juſtif.* That *Juſtification doth not ſo take away the guilt, as that it takes away the deſert of puniſhment from the ſin; which (the ſin it ſelf remaining) can in no ſort be taken way, but it ſo takes away the guilt, that it takes away the deadly effects of it.* I ſay, thoſe words of his are fairly conſiſtent with what I have ſaid: For though a *deſert* of puniſhment be always inſeparable from the nature of ſin it ſelf, yet he that was a *ſinner*, may ceaſe, ſo much as to deſerve puniſhment, I ſay, a demerit of puniſhment is ſeparable from a *ſinner*, or one that was ſo, but not from *ſin*, or from one in whom the ſin it ſelf is remaining; (as *Ameſius* ſpeaketh) but from one, in whom it is taken away, by the application of the blood of Chriſt.

LXIV.

Whereas ſome great Divines have put into their Definition, that Juſtification is an act of God wherein he accepteth us *as* righteous in his ſight; which words may ſeem to imply that Believers are not really righteous in the ſight of God,

God, but meerly accepted as ſuch, or *as if* they were ſuch (as he that pays but half a crown in the pound, may have, by the clemency of his Creditor s, a full diſcharge given him *as if* he had pay'd all) I conceive their meaning may be this; that Believers are, as to all the benefits and advantages of righteouſneſs, or of being righteous, ſo accepted with God upon account of that righteouſneſs of Chriſts, which is theirs by *Imputation* only, as if they had had a real *inherent* righteouſneſs of their own, whereby they had been *formally* righteous in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, as a man is wiſe by his wiſdome, and ſtrong by his ſtrength. They may put an *as*, (or a *tanquam* to it) becauſe we do not hold that the righteouſneſs, or obedience of Chriſt is the *Form* of Juſtification in that *Formal ſenſe* as the rational Soul is the form of a man; but only that it do's *ſupplere vicem, & locum cauſæ formalis*, that is, doth ſtand a Believer in as good ſtead, for matter of ſecurity from hell, and intitling him to heaven, as a compleat perfect righteouſneſs inherent in himſelf could do. Even as the payment made by a *Surety* do's to all intents as much ſecure the *principal* debtor, as if he himſelf had done it; yet can he not in a ſtrict ſenſe be ſaid to be ſo good a paymaſter as if he had made payment himſelf.

LXV.

How God when he juſtifieth can be ſaid to juſtifie us from all our ſins at once, or to pardon to us all our ſins, as well thoſe that are to come,

as

as those that are past, is a thing me-thinks as difficult to explain, as any one thing belonging to the great Doctrine of Justification.

Amesius in his *Chap. de Justif.* sect. 24. saith this, *Sins past are remitted by a formal application, but sins to come only virtually: Sins past are remitted in themselves, sins to come in the subject or person sinning*, &c.

LXVI.

'Tis hard to find a similitude that may sufficiently illustrate that darksome saying of the Reverend *Amesius*; yet I think some light may be given thereunto by such a similitude, or similitudes as follow.

Admit an Annuity of fourscore pounds a year settled upon any person for the time of his life, to be paid by quarterly portions, 20 *l.* every quarter, upon condition that he shall come to such a one to receive it, as oft as it becomes due, and shall give him an Acquittance, wherein he shall greatly acknowledg his thankful acceptance of the Doner's bounty. In this case, I say, there is fourscore pound a year settled upon the foresaid party all at once, *virtually*, for by one deed he is made capable of challenging it in such equal proportions as oft as it shall become due, making good the forementioned proviso's, *viz.* that he come himself in person for it, to the party that is appointed to pay it, and do give him a thankful Acquittance, *&c.* Till the proviso's upon which the actual payment of each Sum of Money be complyed with, he cannot

not actually receive it, but yet it was all *virtually* veſted in him from the very firſt, and he from the firſt time he was inſtated in the Annuity, put into a capacity to receive it, from time, to time, as it ſhould grow due. Or poſſibly the thing may be better explained by ſome ſuch ſimilitude as this.

A rich Father ſending his Son to travel beyond the Seas, deſires a great Merchant of that country, in which his Son is to reſide, to defray all his expences, and to pay off all the bills which ſhall be brought in upon his account, provided he ſhall from time, to time bring the bills of his charges, and expences to him, and requeſt him to ſee them fully diſcharged; and in caſe any of his bills appear to have been inflam'd by great prodigality, and extravagancy he ſhall confeſs, and bewail his fault, and promiſe amendment; and having ſo done, then, and not till then, the Merchant aforeſaid, is, and ſhall be requeſted to make full payment to all his Creditors, and to ſee all, and every of his debts diſcharged. The Son whoſe caſe this is may be ſaid to have all his debts *virtually* pay'd, from the time that his Father took order with ſuch a Merchant for the payment of them, who undertook to ſee it done, becauſe by this means, he can command his debts at any time, doing in order thereunto only ſome certain things which are in his power to do: yet the debts of this Son cannot be ſaid to be *actually* pay'd, becauſe many of them are not yet contracted, as to others of them, he has not yet carried in his bill

to

to the Merchant that undertook to pay whatsoever he should owe, or he hath not as yet confessed, and bewailed his fault, as to some debts contracted by great Profuseness, which was to precede the payment of them, and therefore the *actual* payment of them is yet suspended, notwithstanding it is in his power to procure the actual payment of them, at no long warning, by doing such previous things as are in his power to do, and therefore may all his debts be said to be *virtually* paid, but not *actually*.

The accommodation of that similitude to the purpose in hand is very easie. Or, suppose a Prince has a Favourite, so great in his favour that he hath resolved that he shall never be put to Death for any offence that he can pardon to him, and yet the said Favourite falls time, after time, into such misdemeanors, for which he cannot but be arraigned by Law, and sentenced to Death according to the common course of Justice; yet forasmuch as the Supreme Magistrate has given him assurance that he shall not dye for any offence that he can pardon, and consequently upon humble application for a particular pardon, so oft as he is condemned afresh, he is sure to obtain it; this man may be said to be pardoned *virtually*, though not *actually*, &c.

LXVII.

An Elect, Believing, and therefore justified Sinner, may be said to have all his sins pardoned *virtually*, and in the *Subject*, or Person sinning,

ning, though not in themſelves (as *Ameſius* ſpeaketh) becauſe God hath reſolved, yea, ſo ordered, and fore-laid the matter that ſuch a one ſhall not be finally loſt, and undone, condemn'd, and damn'd: but that the ſatisfaction of Chriſt ſhall, from time to time be ſo effectually applyed by him, for, and in order unto taking away the guilt, or condemning power of ſin, that eventually it ſhall never be his ruin.

LXVIII.

Though all the ſins of ſuch a one may be ſaid to be pardoned in *Subjecto*, or in, and as to the Perſon ſinning, meaning thereby foraſmuch as 'tis certain he ſhall not be damned for his ſins, he hath a pardon *tantamount*. Yet may ſome of his ſins be ſaid not to be *actually* pardoned, ſeeing it is a real truth, that to ſuppoſe a Believer might live or dye without renewed Faith, and Repentance, after the commiſſion of ſome great, and deliberate ſin, were to ſuppoſe he might be damn'd. For ſuch ſins do deprive even Believers, and juſtified Perſons themſelves, though not of *jus adrem*, as to matter of Salvation, yet of *jus in re*. In which ſenſe theſe words of St. *John* are to be underſtood, *viz.* *No murtherer hath eternal Life abiding in him*, i. e. hath an immediate, actual fitneſs, and capacity for Heaven, at the preſent, as thoſe that were unclean, or in a Journey had not for partaking of the Lord's Paſſeover, though they had a habitual right to it.

LXIX.

LXIX.

That Man cannot be ſaid to be Actually and compleatly pardoned, who has any block or bar in his way to Heaven for the preſent, or who cannot enter into Life, or be ſaved under his preſent circumſtances, which may be the caſe of a true Believer, and juſtified Perſon, (witneſs *David*, &c.) therefore every juſtified Perſon is not compleatly and actually pardoned, all his ſins, at all times, but ſome may yet be after a ſort, charged upon him: yet ſith an Elect Believer ſhall certainly have all thoſe blocks taken out of his way, firſt, or laſt, or before he dyes, all his ſins may be ſaid to be virtually pardoned, and in equivalency. As that man might virtually, and in effect, be ſaid to be ſecured from dying by the means of a *Pleuriſie*, who hath a Phyſitian alwayes at hand, perfectly able (if there be any ſuch) and as willing to Cure him of it, becauſe in that caſe his Life would be ſecured from that Diſeaſe *virtually*, yet could he not be ſaid to be *actually* delivered from that Diſeaſe, or the danger of it, in caſe he were apt ever, and anon to fall into it, to ſuch a degree, that if great means, and remedies were not uſed it would be ſure to be his death, &c. So would the greater, and deliberate ſins of juſtified Perſons, certainly be the death of their Souls if Jeſus Chriſt their great Phyſitian, did not from time to time, by renewing Faith in them, whereby to take hold of the Satisfaction and expiation which he by his blood

blood has made in ſuch caſes, relieve them againſt the ſame, which ſheweth that though they be *virtually* pardoned, as to all their ſins, yet not compleatly, actually, and to all intents, and purpoſes: for as Divines ſay, there can be no ſuch pardon obtained for any great, and wilful ſin, without particular renewing of Faith, and Repentance. In that ſenſe it is that they do own theſe kind of ſins to be *mortal*, and not to have a pardon of courſe, as leſſer ſins have upon a general Repentance, which therefore they call *venial*.

LXX.

Reverend Mr. *Durham* in his Book on the *Revelation*, p. 259. puts the Queſtion in theſe words (for I chuſe to give you his own) *How can a man at the firſt exerciſing of Faith be ſaid to be juſtified or pardoned of all his ſins, ſeeing his ſins after Juſtification are not pardoned till they be committed, and Repented of?*

His Anſwer thereunto is in theſe words.

Both are true (ſaith he) *for future ſins are not actually pardoned till they be committed, and repented of, yet is the man a juſtified perſon, and in a juſtified eſtate, having a ground laid in his Juſtification for obtaining the pardon of thoſe ſins that follow, ſo that they ſhall not overturn his former Abſolution, for Gods Covenant hath both fully in it, yet in due way to be applyed. And it is* (ſaith he) *as if a company of Rebels were ſubdued, and by Treaty they are pardoned, changed from the ſtate of Enemies, to be natural Subjects, and priviledged with*

their

their priviledges, ſo that if they fall in after faults (as Subjects may fall in) yet are they never again counted Enemies, nor is their firſt Freedom Canceld, but they are dealt with as native Subjects falling into ſuch offences, and have priviledges that Strangers have not, nor can plead in the ſame faults; one of which priviledges may be ſuppoſed to be, that they ſhall not be rigidly fallen upon, although their guilt deſerve death, but that they ſhall have means uſed to reclaim them, (and theſe ſuch as cannot but be effectual) and that upon recovery they ſhall be pardoned thoſe faults, and be preſerved from the deſerved puniſhments, &c. It is ſo by the Treaty of Grace, and Juſtification; the believing Sinner is tranſlated from the ſtate of an Enemy, to the condition of a Friend, this is unalterable, he cannot afterwards but be a Friend; yet becauſe a Friend may be ingrateful, and may fail to his Benefactor, therefore in this Treaty it is provided, that there ſhall be a way to forgiveneſs by vertue of the Covenant, yet ſo as there ſhall be a new exerciſe of Repentance and Faith, for the commending of the way of grace: And ſo a ſinning Believer is a ſinner, but not in the ſtate of ſin, nor is an Enemy as he was before Juſtification, even as a faulty Subject is guilty, yet is no Enemy, nor Rebel, nor can be puniſhed by death when he becomes penitent, although he deſerveth it, becauſe the Law of Grace is ſuch to the Subjects of that Kingdom, that the pleading of that former Treaty, and betaking themſelves to the terms hereof, is ever to be accepted as a righteouſneſs for them in reference to any particular ſin following Juſtification, as well as what proceeded. And this no

Stranger

Stranger to God can plead, who hath no ſuch ground for his recovery from ſin, or that God will give him Repentance for it, much leſs that he will certainly pardon him. Yea it differeth from a Penitents caſe at firſt converſion, becauſe a Covenanter may expect pardon by vertue of that ſame Covenant in which he is ingaged, and to which he hath already right, and he hath Jus ad rem: *Another cannot do ſo, but muſt conſider the Covenant as aforeſaid only, and ſo expect pardon, not becauſe God is* actually *ingaged to give it to him, as in the others caſe, but becauſe God doth offer to accept of him on thoſe terms, and then to pardon him.* Thus far Mr. *Durham*, &c.

LXXI.

Beſides the *principal efficient cauſe* of Juſtification, which is God, the inwardly moving or Proegumenal *cauſe* which is *Free Grace*, the *Procatarctick cauſe* which was Jeſus Chriſt, the *Material cauſe* which was the Obedience of Chriſt, the *Formal cauſe*, *viz.* the *Imputation* of Chriſts Obedience, and the *Final cauſe*, all which have been ſpoken of already, and proved to be ſuch: there is another cauſe of Juſtification, which might have been brought in under the efficient (for thereunto it belongs as *efficiens minus principalis*) *viz.* the *Inſtrumental cauſe* which is very neceſſary to be diſcourſed of by all thoſe who treat of *Juſtification*, foraſmuch as there are ſome conſiderable controverſies which do depend upon it. Now the *Inſtrumental cauſe* or *condition* of Juſtification (for you may call it either

in different respects) is *Faith*: I call Faith the *Instrument* of Justification, not that it is so immediately (for that might seem to ascribe unto man some kind of efficiency in point of justifying himself) but *mediately*, forasmuch as it is the hand whereby, or wherewith, a Believer receiveth the Righteousness of Christ, by the imputation of which Righteousness he is justified. So that as properly as the cause of a cause may be said to be the cause of that cause's effect, (as the Grandfather of the Grandchild) may *Faith* be said to be the *Instrument* of Justification, it being the instrument of applying, or receiving that Righteousness, by which Believers are justified.

They must needs own *Faith* to be *Instrumental* in, and towards Justification, who affirm it to be the *condition* thereof: For doubtless to perform the condition of any promise made by a faithful person, must needs be *instrumental* for, and towards the performance and enjoyment of the promise it self, sith a faithful promiser when the condition of the promise which he hath made is performed, cannot but perform his promise, if it be in his power. Yea forasmuch as *Faith* is the one onely condition upon which the promise of *Justification* is suspended, *Faith*, in strictness of speaking, is the only (to be sure the most principal) instrument of *Justification*: For what is, or can be so instrumental to obtain the benefit of a good man's promise, as to fulfil the condition upon which he suspended it, when that's done, all is done, for that is all in all.

Though

LXXII.

Though there be other more remote, and leſs principal Inſtruments of Juſtification, yet the moſt immediate, and moſt principal, and the only *Internal Inſtrument* thereof is *Faith* alone.

The Word of God, whereby as an inſtrument, Faith is ingendered: for Faith cometh by hearing, the Miniſters of God who diſpenſe that word, and the holy Sacraments which are a kind of viſible Goſpel, and *Seals of the Righteouſneſs of God which is by Faith*, are remote inſtruments in the hand of God whereby to bring about the Juſtification of a ſinner, *Dan.* 12. 3. But the moſt principal, and immediate inſtrumental cauſe of Juſtification, is *Faith*: For that doth *immediate attingere effectum*. Hence ſuch paſſages as theſe, *Being Juſtified by Faith. By him all that belive are Juſtified.*

LXXIII.

Mr. *Gattaker* p. 70. ſaith that *Though to the full enjoyment of life eternal in Heaven are required many conditions in the Covenant of the Goſpel, as* Faith, Repentance, Charity, Humility, Holineſs, Mortification, Self-denyal, Obedience, Patience, *and* Perſeverance *in good works; yet unto Juſtification is required only* Faith. *For excepting that one place of St.* James, *which aſſigns Juſtification to works, ye ſhall find the Juſtification of a ſinner aſſigned to* Faith *conſtantly, in places almoſt innumerable, and never attributed either to the Love, or Fear of God, or to* Charity, *or* Patience,

but to Faith *in Christ's bloud*, Romans 3. 25.

LXXIV.

Mr. *Perkins* in his *Catholick Reformed, Controverſ.* 4. *cap.* 1. ſaith, *Faith is the alone, and only Inſtrument wrought of God in the heart of a man, whereby he laieth hold on Chriſt, applying his Righteouſneſs to himſelf, which neither Hope, nor Charity, nor any other Grace can do.*

And Learned Bp. *Abbot* ſaith, (writing in defence of *Perkins*) that *Faith though not negatively conſidered excluding other Graces, yet privatively abſtracted from the conſideration of them is ſaid to juſtifie. The wounded* Iſraelites *were cured by meer ſeeing, or looking at the Brazen Serpent without working*, John 3. 14. There believing in Chriſt is compared unto the beholding of the Brazen Serpent.

Chemnitius, in his *Examen Concil Trident. de fid. Juſtif.* giving reaſons why the Proteſtants uſe the word *Sola* of Faith in Juſtification, maketh one to be *ut oſtendatur organum ſeu medium applicationis.* For not by works, but Faith alone is the Promiſe received.

Burges, Prop. 1. ſaith, *They who are for Works and Faith, joyning theſe in our Juſtification, ought to leave out the word* Sola *or only, in Praying, and Preaching.*

LXXV.

If ſome had rather call *Faith* the *Condition* than the *Inſtrumental cauſe* of Juſtification, provided that by *Faith*, and by *Condition*, they underſtand

derſtand what they ought to do, and will own Faith to be the only Condition of *Juſtification*, I ſee no cauſe to be offended at them.

LXXVI.

It may be ſafely ſaid that we are juſtified by Faith, as it is a Condition, provided, the Conditionality of it be limited to the *Receptive* office of Faith, and Gods deſignment thereunto. *B. Prop.* 4. My meaning is, that *Faith* may be ſaid to juſtifie as it is a Condition, provided you allow it to be the condition of Juſtification, not as it is an excellent Grace, Quality, or Work; but as it has a peculiar property for the receiving of Chriſt, and his Righteouſneſs, even as *eating* nouriſheth us (or is as I may ſay the condition of our being nouriſhed) not meerly as it is an *action*, for then walking, or ſpeaking, might do the ſame thing; but as it is that action by which nouriſhment is received into our bodies. It ſeemeth indifferent whether we call *Faith* the *Condition*, or the *Inſtrumental cauſe* of Juſtification, and either is done upon the following accounts.

LXXVII.

Faith is calllled the Condition of the Covenant, becauſe it is upon that Condition that Juſtification is offered unto us therein, and upon this Condition God becomes our God, and Chriſt our Righteouſneſs And it is alſo called the Inſtrumental cauſe of our Juſtification, becauſe it acteth by receiving Chriſt, as he is held

forth in the Word: If that, *viz.* the Goſpel be juſtly called the *External Inſtrumental* cauſe which doth *offer* Chriſt for our Righteouſneſs, then may *Faith* well be called the *Internal Inſtrumental* cauſe, becauſe it doth *receive* him for the ſame end, and becauſe by this *receiving* he becometh our Righteouſneſs, upon which our juſtification is founded, *Durham*, 234.

LXXVIII.

When we ſay that *Faith* is the only *Internal* Inſtrument (for there are ſeveral external ones) of our *Juſtification*, and that it is the condition thereof; our meaning is, that no other work, or grace, is ſo concern'd in, and with our *Juſtification*, as *Faith* is, or that juſtifying of a ſinner is not ſuſpended upon any other than the one onely condition of believing, though juſtifying Faith, be not alone, yet Faith alone juſtifieth, in the quality of of a condition, and is the only *Internal Inſtrument* of Juſtification.

LXXIX.

To be yet more plain (if we can be ſo) *God doth* not impute the Righteouſneſs of his Son to a ſinner, and thereupon make, and account him Righteous to Eternal Life, or one that by his Surety hath ſatisfied his Law and Juſtice, with reſpect had to his *Love*, *Humility*, Repentance, and other Graces (which do accompany ſaving Faith) though upon the account of them alſo they are by God accounted formally, and inherently, but imperfectly Righteous) but only with regard to his *Faith* conſidered in a *privative*

tive abſtractiveneſs, or abſtractive from all other graces, foraſmuch as the promiſe of Juſtification is made to the Grace of *Faith*, and to that alone, or to a Believer only as ſuch.

LXXX.

It is no contradiction to exclude other graces from a *conditionality* as to the act of Juſtification, and yet to affirm them requiſite neceſſarily in the Subject *juſtified*, &c. This Proteſtant Divines do a thouſand times over illuſtrate by divers ſimilitudes. Becauſe Repentance is required as well as Faith muſt their Office, and work be confounded? Certainly it is not *Repentance*, but *Faith* that receiveth the Pardon.

LXXXI.

The diſtinction of Faith Juſtifying, *quæ viva*, but not *qua viva*, which is lively, and working, but not as it is lively, and working, is very good, and ſound; that is, Though only that Faith which is accompanied with Love to God and Man, godly ſorrow for ſin and other graces do juſtifie (becauſe that is the only living and true Faith) yet this living Faith in the buſineſs of juſtifying, or as it juſtifieth Inſtrumentally, is not concurr'd with by any other grace, but is by it ſelf alone.

As the Sun which giveth Light, giveth heat alſo, but it doth not give heat as it is *Corpus luminoſum*, but as it is *Corpus calidum*. The heat of the Sun doth not enlighten, nor the light of the Sun heat, and warm. A King that goeth to his Parliament to ſign Bills, and compleat

Acts of Parliament, ſeldom goeth without a conſiderable Guard, and Retinue, but when all comes to all, 'tis he that ſigns all the Bills, and the reſt of his Company have nothing to do in that affair. So Faith hath a large Retinue of Graces, uſeful for many other good purpoſes, but ſuch as do not meddle or make more or leſs in that great buſineſs of Juſtification, but leave all that affair (as God hath left it) to Faith alone, &c.

LXXXII.

We may obſerve, ſaith Mr. Gataker *p.* 79. *that God's pardon is often aſcribed to Repentance* as well as to Faith, (*Acts* 2. 38. *Mark* 1. 4. *& alibi poſſim*) both being conditions of our reconciliation to God, *but Juſtification is only attributed to Faith, but never to Repentance. The Reaſon* (ſaith he, is evident) becauſe ſorrow for ſin though ſerious and effectual in the converſion of a ſinner to God, brings not an equivalent ſatisfaction to the Juſtice of God, but Faith brings with it the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and tenders the obedience of Chriſt our Surety as our own unto God for Juſtification, B. *Prop.* 1.

LXXXIII.

Though Proteſtant writers in this controverſie did chiefly militate againſt the *merit*, and *cauſality* of works in Juſtification, then aſſerted by the Papiſts; yet it is plain that they did thereby exclude their *Conditionality* alſo as to the act

act of Juſtification, &c. *We cannot, ſaith* Gattaker, 68. *be too zealous in this becauſe the conceit of Juſtification by Works is a ſlippery opinion, and we ſee by Experience how eaſily, though almoſt inſenſibly, the Papiſts ſlid and fell by riſing in their own proud Imagination from Juſtification by Works* into the preſumption of *merit*, by good works. But the Apoſtle oppoſeth the former, and by conſequence *a Minori ad majus*, excludes the latter.

LXXXIV.

Neither is this Juſtification by *Faith* alone, excluding the *Conditionality* of Works to be applyed to our Juſtification, at firſt, only, but as continued: ſo that firſt, and laſt, we are juſtified by Faith alone, *Gal.* 3. 11. *The juſt ſhall live by Faith*, which belongs to the whole courſe of their Lives reſpectively to Juſtification. And when the Apoſtle ſaith, *Rom.* 5. *Being juſtified by Faith we have peace with God*; would it not be irrational to limit it only to our Juſtification at firſt? Is not *the Righteouſneſs of God revealed from Faith to Faith, not from Faith to Works?* Rom. 1. 17.

LXXXV.

That Faith is concerned in the buſineſs of Juſtification only, as a condition, or Inſtrument, ſo far, and no farther, is evident, becauſe though the Scripture doth often ſpeak of our being juſtified πιστει, & δια πιστεως, yet never δια την πιστιν by Faith, yet never for Faith.

LXXXVI.

LXXXVI.

If it be enquired what that Faith is which is the condition or Inſtrument of Juſtification; I ſhall anſwer no more at preſent but this, *viz.* Faith is that Grace whereby Jeſus Chriſt is received to all intents and purpoſes as he is offered to ſinners in the Goſpel.

LXXXVII.

The fore-ſaid deſcription of Faith furnisheth us with one Argument for Faith being the only *Condition*, or *Inſtrumental* cauſe of Juſtification, *Ex. gr.* It is the Righteouſneſs, Obedience, or Satisfaction of Chriſt imputed, or put to our account which juſtifieth. That Righteouſneſs is freely offered to ſinners in the Goſpel to be made theirs upon ſuch terms. Being ſo offered, there is nothing more requiſite to make it ours but our ſo accepting of it. Now, Faith is that our acceptance of it ſo as it is offered, *&c.*

When ſo accepted the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt becomes ours, and when it is once actually ſo, then are we actually juſtified without any more ado, and other Graces are ſervicable to us for other purpoſes, but not to juſtifie us. For *fruſtra fit per plura*, and when any thing is heartily offered, there needs nothing but accepting it upon the terms ſpecified.

LXXXVIII.

LXXXVIII.

When Faith is ſpoken of in the Scripture as the *Inſtrument*, or *Condition* of Juſtification (call it whether you will) thereby is meant the *Habit*, *Grace*, or *Act* of Faith, ſuch as was expreſſed, not the *object*, *viz. The Goſpel of Chriſt*, *or Covenant of Grace*, as ſome would carry it, becauſe the word Faith is ſometimes ſo taken, *Er.gr. Gal.* 3.23. *Before Faith came.* For beſides that words are to be taken in the moſt uſual and famous ſenſe, unleſs there be particular, and ſpecial reaſon to the contrary (which cannot be ſhewed in thoſe places where Faith is ſpoken of as the *Inſtrument* or *Condition* of Juſtification; I ſay, beſides that, it will be found that if you put the word *Goſpel* or *Covenant of Grace*, inſtead of the word *Faith* where Faith is ſpoken of as the Inſtrument of Juſtification; there will ariſe a very inconvenient ſenſe.

LXXXIX.

The moſt uſual and general ſignification of the word *Faith*, is as it is taken for the *Grace* of *Faith*, or the Act thereof, and there is no inconvenient ſenſe ariſes from taking it ſo when Faith is ſpoken of as the Inſtrument of our Juſtification, *Ergo*. It ought to be ſo taken. Poſſibly in fifty places of the New Teſtament Faith is taken for the Grace of Faith, and in very few in any other ſenſe. To be ſure it is ſo taken in *Heb.* 11. where Faith is ſo much ſpoken of and defined, *v.* 1. *Faith is*

the

things hoped for, &c. *v.* 4. *By* „*ered to God*, &c. Faith in that one Chapter is about ſixteen or ſeventeen times taken for the Grace of Faith, and not for the Goſpel of Chriſt. Neither would any inconvenient conſtruction ariſe if we take it as meant of the grace of Faith when we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith *Inſtrumentally*, *Ex. gr.* Rom. 3.25. *To be a propitiation through Faith in his Blood.* Now, though the blood of Chriſt be the Seal of the New Covenant, yet certainly the Apoſtle intended not here to ſpeak of that, but of the meanes, on our part, whereby we are made partakers of Chriſt's Redemption, and propitiation, *Gal.* 7.3. So *Rom.* 5. 1. when the Apoſtle ſaith, *being juſtified by Faith, we have Peace with God*; why ſhould not *Faith* be taken for the Grace of *Faith* correlative to it's object Jeſus Chriſt? So *Gal.* 2. 16. *Even we have believed in Jeſus Chriſt, that we might be juſtified by the Faith of Chriſt*, &c. *i.e.* by the grace of Faith, or by believing in Jeſus Chriſt.

XC.

Should we take *Faith* for the *Goſpel*, or *Covenant of Grace*, in the places laſt mentioned, as a more unuſual, ſo a more inconvenient, leſs congruous, and leſs probable ſenſe would ariſe from thence, if not untrue, and abſurd. *Ex. gr.* when the Apoſtle ſaith, *Being juſtified by Faith*, Rom. 5. 1. We ſhould read being juſtified by the *Goſpel*, or *Covenant of* , againſt that el juſtifieth no Man,

Man, unleſs it be applyed by *Faith*, men may hear the Goſpel, and yet never be juſtified, but they cannot believe the Goſpel, with a true and lively Faith, and not be juſtified. So thoſe words, *Gal.* 2. 16. *Knowing that a man is juſtified by the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt*, ought not to be underſtood of the *Object* of Faith, *viz.* the *Goſpel*, but of the Grace of Faith, for could he have been juſtified by the Goſpel only (or as the only Inſtrument of his juſtification) what need he have added, *even we have believed in Jeſus Chriſt, that we might be juſtified*, &c. So 'tis moſt certain that Jeſus Chriſt is not actually a propitiation for our ſins, meerly through the *Goſpel*, or *Covenant of Grace*, unleſs the Grace of Faith doth intervene actually to intereſs us in his Sacrifice, and Satisfaction, and therefore it is inconvenient by *Faith in his Blood*, to underſtand the *Goſpel*, or *Covenant of Grace* ſealed with his Blood, &c.

There are two other Texts in *Rom.* 3. which would be very incommodiouſly applyed to the *Goſpel*, where *Faith* is mentioned as the Inſtrument, or Condition of Juſtification, *v.* 22 *Even the Righteouſneſs of God which is by Faith of* Jeſus Chriſt *unto all, and upon all them that believe.* Do not the latter words ſhew that the *Grace of Faith*, not the *objectum quod* of Faith, which is the *Goſpel*, is there to be underſtood by *Faith?* To be ſure in that latter clauſe Faith is ſpoken of as an Inſtrument, yea, as a condition of Juſtification. Now, the *Goſpel*, though it is an *external, remote* Inſtrument of juſtifying a ſinner, as it is the

the Inſtrument of *Faith*, or means of *believing*, yet Faith is the more immediate Inſtrument of the two, and a condition alſo, which the *Goſpel* cannot be ſaid to be. Alſo from *v.* 26. we argue, that by *Faith* in the 25 verſe, not the *Goſpel*, but the *Grace of Faith* is meant, becauſe the words are, that he *might be juſt and the juſtifier of him which believeth in Jeſus.*

XCI.

Faith is ſuch an Inſtrument of Juſtification as upon which Juſtification doth always inſue: For whoſoever truly believeth in Jeſus Chriſt, is, and ſhall be juſtified, but ſo is not the *Goſpel*, or the *Covenant of Grace*: For the Goſpel has been, and may be preached to thouſands, who never did, nor ever will come to believe, *&c.* Now is it not more proper to attribute an effect to the immediate, and effectual cauſe, than to a cauſe that is more remote, and often ineffectual? and conſequently our Juſtificatinn, to the Grace of Faith, than to the object of *Faith*, viz. *the Goſpel?* 'Tis harſh to ſay that we are juſtified by that (as namely by the *Goſpel*) which we may have, and enjoy, and never be juſtified, and much eaſier to conceive how we may be ſaid to be juſtified by that, (as namely by *Faith*) upon the having (and uſing) of which, we cannot but be juſtified.

XCII.

When we are ſaid to be Juſtified by Faith, as *Rom.* 5. 1. the Faith there ſpoken of, is not

to

to be taken *Metonymically*, *viz.* the *cauſe* put for the *effect*, and Faith which is the root of good works, put for good works, which are the fruit of ſaving Faith.

XCIII.

Neither is Faith there taken *Synecdochically* as a part for the whole, or as one Virtue for all her inſeperable companions, for which a Believer is accepted of a gracious God. Faith is not there taken as a complexive word, that includes *Love*, and *Fear*, and holy *Obedience*, and in Conjunction with all theſe doth produce Juſtification.

XCIV.

Thus ſome by giving the name of *Faith* to all ſorts of *Graces*, yea and of *good works*, do hook, and hedge in the Popiſh Doctrine of Juſtification by works, under the wing of ſomething *called Faith* (as the *Quakers* do under the name of *Chriſt*; telling us firſt, that Chriſt is the Light within them, and ſecondly, that to follow the Light within them, whereby they mean nothing elſe but doing of good works, in conformity to natural Light, will bring us to Heaven.)

XCV.

Thoſe that cannot brook *Juſtification* by *Faith* alone, as the only *Internal Inſtrumental* cauſe, but would concern the whole of Goſpel Obedience in the buſineſs of Juſtification, go this way to work, *viz.* they tell us, that God hath a

double

double Court, one may be compared to our *Kings Bench* (a ſtrict Tribunal of Juſtice) wherein the Offender is tryed according to Law: So when God proceeds againſt a ſinner accordiag to the *Covenant of works* by the Law, there is no hope of Juſtification by works, becauſe all have ſinned, and the Law is to all a Miniſtry of Condemnation, and an inſtrument of death: For there is no mention of Repentance, or room for Reconciliation, in the firſt covenant of the Law. But God hath ſet up another Court, as it were of *Chancery*, where *Clemiana*, or a temperament of equity is admitted, where God by a new Covenant of Mercy moderateth the ſtrictneſs of the the Law, and requires not exact, but ſincere Obedience. And though St. *Paul* deny Juſtification to the works of the Law, yet he contradicts not St. *James*, who ſaith a man is juſtified by good works in Gods *Court of Equity* under the Goſpel. And they obſerve, that though the Sts. do decline God's Judgment, where exact Juſtice keeps the Court, yet the Sts. often plead their own Righteouſneſs before a Merciful God, who accepts their ſincere endeavours, and acts of Obedience. *The Socinians pleaſe themſelves with this diſtinction who deny Chriſts Satisfaction*, and conſequently acknowledg no uſe of Faith in his bloud; for apprehending, or applying of Chriſts Righteouſneſs for our Juſtification, *and teach that a man is Juſtified* by his operative Faith, and ſincere Obedience, which God by the New Covenant of Grace, accepts unto righteonſneſs, though it be not exactly conformable

to

to the Rule of the Law. Others alſo who acknowledg the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt purchaſed by his propitiatory Sacrifice, yet imbrace this diſtinction, and do think that Goſpel obedience concurs with Faith unto our Juſtification; becauſe God accepts even the defective ſervices of his Children. And they imagin that St. *Paul*, and St. *Peter* may be accorded by taking *Faith* in a Figurative ſenſe, when the former ſpeaks of *Juſtification* by Faith, *&c.* *Gattaker* 66, 67.

XCVI.

The grounds they go upon for taking Faith for all Graces, yea for all good works, for the ſum total of all Goſpel-obedience, are very inſufficient; as namely this for one: Becauſe the word ἀπιθεια ſignifies both *Incredulity*, and *diſobedience*, and ὁ ἀπιθῶν is oppoſed to τῷ πιστεύοντι *John* 3. 36. Therefore Faith (they ſuppoſe) imports not only *Belief*, but alſo *Obedience*.

The ſtrength of that Argument is meer weakneſs. For, 1. Though a word have two ſeveral ſignifications it do's not follow that it is always to be taken in both, or that thoſe two come all to one. 2. It follows not becauſe ἀπιθεια ſignifieth either *unbelief*, or *diſobedience*, or *both*; that therefore the word πειθω from which it comes, ſignifieth the two contrary things, being without the privative particle, for though it doth ſignifie to *obey*, yet no where to *believe*. 3. The word ἀπιθεια ſignifieth *pertinaciam non credendi etiam viſis, & auditis idoneis documentis, q. d. Impерſuaſibilitatem Æſtius ad*, Rom.

11. 30. Απειθῆς signifies more than ἄπιστος, viz. *Qui non tantum non credit sed recta monentibus resistit.* Therefore it will not follow that the word which is of a contrary signification, doth signifie *Faith*, and nothing else, but rather it should signifie an *easiness of Believing*, or of being perswaded, to own the Truths of the Gospel, *&c.* 4. Neither is there any word as is directly contrary to απειθεια & ἀπειθῆς *viz.* any such word as πειθεια, πειθης, whereby Faith, or a Believer may be signified, *&c.* Therefore from the notation of these words, no Argument can be drawn that to believe, and to yield sincere Obedience to the whole Gospel are all one, or the same thing.

XCVII.

They who contend for Faith being a Complexive word, signifying all sorts of Graces, and the sum total of Gospel Obedience, and of all good works, do pretend that to the best of their understanding. St. *Paul* and St. *James* cannot be otherwise reconciled, and for that reason, they are induced to take *Faith* in so large a sense, as that it may include works, &c. Now, that Reason will easily fall to the ground if we can prove that St. *Paul* and St. *James* may be fairly accorded without it, as also that they two ought not to be so reconciled.

XCVIII.

XCVIII.

The paſſages in which St. *Paul* and St. *James* ſeem to ſome to differ, *toto Cœlo* are theſe. St. *Paul* ſaith, *Rom.* 3. 28. *We conclude that a man is juſtified by Faith without the deeds of the Law*, and *Rom.* 4. 2, 3. *For if* Abraham *were juſtified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God. For what ſaith the Scripture*, Abraham *believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteouſneſs.* v. 4. *Now, to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of Grace, but of Debt*, v. 5. *But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that juſtifieth the ungodly, his Faith is counted for Righteouſneſs*, v. 6. *Even as* David *alſo deſcribeth the bleſſedneſs of the man to whom God imputeth Righteouſneſs without works.* Thus far St. *Paul.*

Then comes St. *James*, and ſaith, *Jam.* 2. 20. 24. *But wilt thou know, O vain Man, that Faith without works is dead? Was not* Abraham *our Father juſtified by works when he had offered* Iſaac *his Son upon the Altar? Seeſt thou how Faith wrought with his Works, and by Works was his Faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled, which ſaith*, Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs, and he was called the Friend of God*, v. 25. *Ye ſee then, how that by Works, a Man is juſtified, and not by Faith only.* 25. *Likewiſe alſo was not* Rahab *the Harlot juſtified by Works when ſhe had received the Meſſengers, and had ſent them another way? For as the Body without the Spirit is dead, ſo Faith without works is dead alſo.*

XCIX.

We ſhall find there is no need to confound *Faith* and *Works* together, in order to reconciling theſe two Apoſtles. For though in words they ſeem to contradict each other, yet in very deed they do not, yea, cannot, becauſe they do not ſpeak *ad idem*, or *circa idem*, but of different *manners*. For St. *Paul* diſcourſeth how our *Perſons* are juſtified before God, but St. *James*, how our *Faith* muſt be juſtified before Men. Now, our *Perſons* are juſtified by *Faith*, but our *Faith* by good *works*. They who ſay theſe two things, do not thwart one another, more, or leſs. *Zanchy* ſaith, *Fides juſtificat hominem, opera juſtificant fidem.*

C.

St. *James* his buſineſs is to prove that a bare Profeſſion, or boaſting of Faith, not accompanied with good works, can juſtifie no man, nor aſſure the World that his Faith is ſuch as will juſtifie him before God. This I make appear from *Jam.* 2. 14. *What doth it profit my Brethren, if a Man ſay he hath Faith, and hath not Works?* 2. Becauſe he compareth it with a vain Oſtentation of *Charity*, v. 15, 16, 17. *If a Brother or Siſter be naked and deſtitute of daily food, And one of you ſay unto them, depart in peace, notwithſtanding you give them not thoſe things which are needful to the Body, what doth it profit? Even ſo Faith, if it have no Works, is dead being alone.* 3. Becauſe he compareth it with the Faith that Devils

Devils have, which being without Works is dead, *v.* 19. *The Devils alſo believe, and tremble,* v. 20. *But wilt thou know, O vain Man, that Faith without Works is dead.* 3. But that Faith accompanied with good works doth juſtifie both before God, and Men, he proveth by the Example of *Abraham* when he offered his Son, *Gen.* 22. 12. who nevertheleſs was long before that time juſtified by Faith in the ſight of God. *Gen.* 15. 6. Therefore theſe words are not to be underſtood of his Juſtification to Eternal Life. Moreover, God ſaith to *Abraham*, Gen. 22. 12. *Now I know that thou feareſt God.* For by Faith, and good Works, both Internal, and External, we approve our ſelves, both to God, and Men. Then as for the following inſtance of *Rahab*, doubtleſs ſhe is ſaid to have been juſtified by Works, in the ſame way and manner that *Abraham* was, to ſhew, that not only the Jews which ſprung from *Abraham*, but the truly believing Gentiles alſo, were juſtified after the ſame manner that he was.

CI.

It is as true that the Reconciling of St. *Paul*, and St. *James* ought not to be attempted by making *Faith*, and *good works* one, and the ſame thing; as that it is poſſible to reconcile them otherwiſe: I ſay, it is moſt certain that we ought not to attempt the Reconciling of thoſe two Apoſtles, by ſaying that we are juſtified both by *Faith*, and by good *Works*, or that *Faith* is the ſame with all *Goſpel Obedience*, be-

cauſe there is a very great ſtream, and torrent of Scripture running to the contrary, and expreſly excluding good works from having any hand in our Juſtification. Read at large *Rom.* 3.20. *Rom.* 4.6. *Eph.* 2 8,9. *Titus* 3.5. 2 *Cor.* 5.19 2 *Tim.* 1.9. 2 *Cor.* 5.21. 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. *Jer.* 23.6. *Rom.* 3.24,25. *Rom.* 5.18, 19. *Gal.* 2.16. *Rom.* 4.5. *Rom.* 5.28.

CII.

No Man is, or can be juſtified either by works done before Regeneration, nor by works done by him after Regeneration, neither by the works of the *Ceremonial Law*, nor by the works of the *Moral Law*, nor by *Evangelical Obedience* (as ſuch) nor by *Faith*, or the τὸ *credere*, as it is a work: I ſay, by none of all theſe, nor yet by all theſe together, can any Man be juſtified in the ſight of God; no, not ſo much as *Inſtrumentally*, much leſs by theſe as the *Material*, or *Formal Cauſe* of his Juſtification, or as the matter of his Righteouſneſs before God, &c. Becauſe the Scripture excludes all ſorts of *works*, conſidered as ſuch, from our having any hand in the Juſtification of a ſinner, and puts that upon *Faith* alone, and upon that but as an *Inſtrument*, or hand whereby we receive that Righteouſneſs of Chriſt which alone *doth*, and which only *can* juſtifie us.

CIII.

CIII.

That the works of the *Ceremonial Law* do not, or cannot concur to the juſtifying of a ſinner, need not to be proved amongſt Chriſtians now adayes, ſith that Law is well known to have been long ſince not only *dead*, but *deadly*. *If ye now be circumciſed Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing*. Whether tends the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, but to encounter with thoſe as would make a medley of *Judaiſm*, and *Chriſtianiſm*, and urged a neceſſity of the *Ceremonial Law* upon the Gentile Converts? Againſt thoſe he proves that neither *Jews*, nor *Gentiles*, are juſtified by the Covenant made in *Horeb*, but by *Faith* in Chriſt, according to the Covenant made with *Abraham* 430 years before the Law, *Gal.* 3. 8, 17. And therefore now to ſeek Righteouſneſs by the works of the Law is to fall from the grace of Chriſt. *Gattak.* 74.

CIV.

Neither can Men be juſtified by works of what ſort, or *Law*, ſoever done in an *unregenerate eſtate*. The reaſon is plain, becauſe ſuch works cannot pleaſe God. *They that are in the fleſh cannot pleaſe God. Without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God.* Moreover, the Papiſts themſelves do grant that men are not juſtified by works done before, but only after their *Regeneration*.

CV.

No man is or can be juſtified by the works of the *Moral Law*, or by works done in obſervance of the ten Commandments. For St. *Paul* in the Epiſtle to the *Romans* deals with thoſe who inſiſted more upon their obedience to the *Moral Law*, (though they did not exclude the obſervance of the *Ceremonial*) and they would fain eſtabliſh a righteouſneſs upon their own works performed out of obedience to Gods Commands, *Rom.* 9. 31, 32. & 10. 3.

CVI.

That when *Paul* excludeth *Works* from any hand in our Juſtification, he intendeth as well thoſe of the *Moral*, as the *Ceremonial* Law: I prove thus, yea that he argueth principally againſt works done in conformity to the *Moral* Law, that they have no power to juſtifie us. For 1. He treateth of the Law by which ſinners ſhall be judged, which is the *Moral* Law, *Rom.* 2. 12. 2 Of the Law that was written in the hearts of the Heathen, yea of all men, *v.* 14. and that the *Ceremonial* Law never was, but the *Moral*. 3. Of that Law which forbad Adultery, and Sacriledge, and by the breaking of which, the *Jews* diſhonored God (who were ſtrict in obſerving the *Ceremonial* Law) and was not that the *Moral* Law? *v.* 22, 23. 4. Of the Law by which is the knowledg of ſin, *Rom.* 3. 20. now do's not that *Moral Law* make the greateſt diſcovery of ſin? was it not by the *Moral*

ral Law that *Paul* knew Concupiſcence to be ſin, which otherwiſe he had not known? now the *Apoſtle* denies Juſtification to be by the works of that Law which diſcoverth ſin. 5. *He denies Juſtification by the works of the Law, which he went about not to aboliſh but to eſtabliſh*, Rom. 3. 31. *That muſt needs be the* Moral Law, for the *Ceremonial Law* he labored to aboliſh, and to eſtabliſh only the *Moral*. 6. *He treats of that Law* which hath ſaid, *Thou ſhalt not Covet*, Rom. 7. 7. and is not that the purport of the tenth Commandment? 7. *Of that Law which curſeth every one that continueth not in all that is written therein to do it*, Gal. 3. 10. *and that was the Moral Law, witneſs* Deut. 27. 26. For there (whence theſe words *Gal.* 3. are quoted) *Curſed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them*, doth bring up the arrear of the Curſes from Mount *Ebal*, beginning *v.* 15. *Curſed be he that maketh any graven Image*, &c. *If the Law therefore* there mentioned be ſpoken of as a *Covenant of Works* to them that are under the Law, it muſt needs be meant of the *Moral Law*, for the *Ceremonial Law* was never any part of the *Covenant of Works* made with *Adam* in Paradiſe; for it was not then extant, yea it was a kind of *Typical Goſpel*. 8. Of that Law which is fulfilled in this, *Thou ſhalt love thy Neighbour as thy ſelf*, Rom. 13. 8, 9. By all theſe paſſages it appeareth, that it is the *Moral Law* of which St. *Paul* chiefly treateth, denying that it is poſſible for any man to be juſtified by the works thereof.

CVII.

CVII.

Yea no man can be juſtified by *Evangelical Works*, or by ſincere obedience to the Goſpel. I do not well know how to diſtinguiſh betwixt obedience to the *Moral Law*, and *obedience to the Goſpel*, fith the *Moral Law*, or ten Commandments, are the Rule of a Goſpel Converſation. And indeed the *Moral Law* was publiſhed from *Mount Sinai*, and written in Tables of Stone, ſome hundreds of yea s after the publication of the Goſpel; and as it could *not diſanul the Goſpel*, ſo was it added as a clearer, and more legibly written Rule, to thoſe that were under the Goſpel, when the characters of the *Innate Law* were ſcarce to be read. Moreover, If *the grace of God which bringeth Salvation* (whereby is meant the Goſpel) *teacheth us to live Righteouſly, ſoberly and Godly in this world*, do not the ten Commandments teach the ſame?

CVIII.

But whereas *Faith* and *Repentance* are commonly called by the name of *Goſpel-duties* (as *Unbelief*, and *Impenitency* by the name of *Sins againſt the Goſpel*) for this reaſon it may be, *viz.* becauſe the *Moral Law* whilſt it was in the nature, and quality of a meer *Covenant of Works*, as to *Adam* in Paradiſe, commanded no ſuch thing as that which we call *Faith*, and *Repentance*, and by the *New Covenant* only theſe two great Duties are diſcovered, and impoſed, I ſay admitting ſome diſtinction betwixt the *Moral Law*,

Law, and the *Law of the Goſpel*, upon the account aforeſaid, no man is, or can be juſtified by obedience to the Goſpel, or by *Evangelical Works* in that acceptation, that is, by his *Repentance*, nor yet by his *Faith*, or τὸ *credere*, as it is a *Work*, but meerly as it is an *Inſtrument* whereby we receive Chriſt, and his Righteouſneſs.

CIX.

We are not, nor cannot be juſtified by *Evangelical Works*, *Evangelically* performed, *viz.* from a principal of true Grace, and Spiritual life (and not meerly of nature, and free will) therefore not by any works whatſoever, much leſs by thoſe *Evangelical* works which are ſo only for the *matter* of them, as external Repentance, or ſorrow for ſin, that is ſhort of *Godly ſorrow never more to be repented of*, or *Common Faith*, ſhort of the Faith of Gods Elect. Was not *Abrahams* Obedience in following God's call out of his Country in Circumciſing himſelf, & his Family, and in offering his only Son *Iſaac*, an evident fruit of his *Faith*? (as we are told, *Heb.* 11. By Faith *Abraham* did ſo, & ſo) therefore they muſt needs be *Evangelical* works, *Evangelically* performed, or good works, both for *matter*, and *manner*. And yet St. *Paul* teacheth (for all this) that *Abraham* was ſo juſtified by *Faith*, that his Obedience had no influence upon his Juſtification, *Rom.* 3.2. *If Abraham were juſtified by works he hath whereof to glory, but not before God*, which is an Elliptick ſpeech amounting to thus much. But

Abra-

Abraham hath not whereof to glory before God, *v.* 3. *For what ſaith the Scripture?* Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs*, &c. See alſo *v.* 4, & 5. See alſo *Gal.* 3. 6, 7, 8, 9. If theſe Heroick Acts of Obedience came not into account for abſolving *Abraham* from the guilt of ſin, but his Faith on him *that juſtifieth the ungodly, was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs*, and indeed long before the Sacrificing of his Son, then the works of Goſpel Obedience ought not to be crowded with Faith into the means of our Juſtification. *Gata.* 3. 6. Who knows not that *David* was a Regenerate Man, a Man after God's own heart, which *fulfilled all his will*, Acts 13. 22? And yet *David* himſelf did not expect the bleſſedneſs of Juſtification (or Salvation) upon account of his own works, or Goſpel Obedience, *Rom.* 4. 6. *Even as* David *deſcribeth the Bleſſedneſs of the man unto whom God imputeth Righteouſneſs without works.* v. 7. *Saying, Bleſſed are they whoſe Iniquities are forgiven*, &c. Plainly intimating that God is reconciled to the World of true Believers, not imputing their tranſgreſſions to them, becauſe he imputes unto them the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which needs not our *works* to aſſiſt it, but requires our *Faith* to receive it.

Read further what *David* ſaith, *Pſal.* 143. 2. and what St. *Paul* ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 4. 4.

CX.

CX.

That ſincere Obedience to the Goſpel, and Good works, the Companions and effects of Faith, are not intended by the word *Faith*, and involved therein, when we are ſaid to be juſtified by *Faith*, as an *Inſtrument* (or Inſtrumentally) is evident, becauſe then the Apoſtle's concluſion would run thus, *Rom.* 3. 27, 28. *Boaſting is excluded not by the Law of Works, but by the Law of Faith.* Whereby we mean Obedience, and good Works. *Therefore we conclude that a Man is juſtified by Faith*, that is, by *Obedience*, and *Good Works, without the works of the Law.* Can we imagine that the Apoſtle who excludes not only obedience to the *Moral* Law (of which he ſpeaks principally, as hath been proved at large) but alſo the Obedience of *Abraham* (which was an *Evangelical* ſelf-denial) from the power, or ground of Juſtification, and oppoſes the way of *Faith* to the way of *Works* in order to *Juſtification*, did mean by *Faith, good Works*, and intended that we ſhould expound Faith by Obedience? Who ſees not a violence offered to the Apoſtle's words, when they are thus diſtorted from their genuine ſignification to a Figurative ſenſe? And who ſees not that ſuch a way of Arguing appears to be very abſurd and ſelf-contradicting?

CXI.

CXI.

To ſay that Works are excluded from Juſtification not as Works, or pieces of Goſpel Obedience, but as ſuppoſed by ſome to be *meritorious*, is a poor evaſion that has no truth in it. Becauſe *Faith* is affirm'd to be a cauſe of Juſtification, or to concur to Juſtification, in that ſenſe that *Works* are denied ſo to do; but *Faith* is not affirmed to be the *meritorious cauſe* of Juſtification. Therefore Works are not in that ſenſe denied to be the cauſe of *Juſtification*, when they are oppoſed to Faith. *Works* are plainly denyed to be the cauſe of Juſtification in that ſenſe that *Faith* is aſſerted ſo to be, *Rom.* 3. 28. *Therefore we conclude a man is juſtified by Faith without the deeds of the Law.* But a man is not there ſaid, or intended, to be juſtified by Faith as a *meritorious cauſe*. Therefore *works* are not there excluded from Juſtification, as pretended to be *meritorious* cauſes thereof.

CXII.

To be juſtified by *Works*, and by *Merits*, ſeem in the Apoſtle's ſenſe to be one, and the ſame thing. Therefore if we are not juſtified by *merits*, neither are we juſtified by *works*. The Apoſtle ſeems plainly to aſſert that if our Juſtification were by *works*, we might plead *merit*, that it *would not be of grace but of debt*, Rom. 4. 4. *To him that worketh is the reward reckoned not of grace, but of debt.* Therefore they that deny *Juſtification* by *merit*, ought to deny Juſtification by *works* alſo. For one, according to St.

Paul

Paul, would neceſſarily follow upon the other.

CXIII.

To ſay that good works, if they were owned as one cauſe of *Juſtification*, could not pretend to any thing of *merit*, or meritoriouſneſs, becauſe they cannot be performed but by grace, and ſtrength received from God, who muſt *work all our works in us, and for us*, is to ſay nothing to the purpoſe. For if that were true, *Adam* could not have *merited* at God's hand had he ſtood in the ſtate of *Innocency*, becauſe it was God *made man righteous*, even the firſt Man, and who indued him with that habitual Grace, and aſſiſted him with that Divine concourſe, which was ſufficient to have continued him in that holy, and happy eſtate in which he was created, and to have advanced him to a better (as is generally held.) But do not the generality of our Divines grant that *Adam* by well uſing, or improving that ſtock of Grace which he had received from God, might have *merited* at God's hands, if not in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, yet in a ſenſe ſufficiently ſafe, proper, and allowable?

CXIV.

If God would have rewarded *Adam not of Grace, but of Debt*, in caſe he had perſiſted in his innocency, then *Adam*, according to St. *Paul*, might have been ſaid to have *merited* his reward, in as much as he ſhould have had it upon the account not of *believing*, but of *working*, *Rom.* 4. 4. For ſaid he, *To him that worketh is the reward not reckone*

reckoned of grace but of debt. Now to be rewarded as of debt, and not of grace, is to be rewarded upon the account of *Merit*; or of what God is pleaſed to own for ſuch.

CXV.

When the Apoſtle excludeth *Works* from Juſtifying us, ſo as *Faith* doth, or being the *Inſtrument*, or *Condition* of our Juſtification, he would no where be underſtood thereby to intend ſuch works as are *perfect* and *faultleſs*. For 1. He ſhould then exclude thoſe works which are no where to be found, and therefore need not to be excluded: which ſeems to have been as needleſs, as a Queſtion which ſome are ſaid to have put, who diſputed upon this problem, whether it were lawful for us to work Miracles? or whether they might lawfully work Miracles? who might have forborn to have queri'd about the lawfulneſs of uſing ſuch a power, till they had firſt had ſuch a power to uſe. And 2. If it be ſaid that ſuch works are to be found in the conceit and imagination of ſome men, I anſwer, it do's not appear that St. *Paul* was contending with that ſort of men, or doth in all his *Epiſtle to the Romans* take notice of men of that opinion in his time. 3. Whereas there were in his time, many pretenders to Juſtification by *Works*, it ſeemeth moſt probable, that they were ſuch who doubted not but God would take their good works as he found them, and for them graciouſly accept, and juſtifie them, as being the beſt works they were able to do, though they knew

knew they were attended with ſome failings, and imperfections. Tho ſome have found it too eaſie to them to think that God will juſtifie them for their ſincere, though imperfect obedience; yet it ſeems a very hard matter for any conſiderate man (or perſon worth confuting) to think that nothing of weakneſs, and imperfection doth cleave to his good works. St. *Paul* ſaith of the *Gentiles*, Rom. 1. that their *Conſciences did accuſe them* (for ſome things) as well as excuſe them in others. 5. When the *Apoſtle* ſaith *what the Law cannot do in that it is weak through the fleſh*, &c. though he glanceth at the imperfection of our works, yet he ſeems to bring it in as a thing that was *known*, or needed not to be proved, that our fleſh was weak, that is, we in this corrupt ſtate could not do works that are perfectly good, and to give that which he took *pro conceſſo*, as the reaſon why the Law could not juſtifie us, *viz.* becauſe we cannot keep it perfectly, and it can juſtifie none but them that can. 6. The Apoſtle in that text ſeems to take two things for granted, or ſuch as would eaſily be owned, *viz.* 1. That the *Law* (or *Covenant* of works) could not juſtifie one that could not keep it perfectly. 2. That man in his fleſhly, or fallen ſtate, or ſince his fall, could not do that. And by thoſe two confeſſed *Mediums*, or Propoſitions, he proves this concluſion, *viz.* That the Law could not juſtifie fallen man. 7. But neither from this text, or any other, doth it appear that St. *Paul* was troubled with a ſort of men who dream'd of their own works, being every

way *perfect*, and did make it his buſineſs to oppoſe them, but only ſuch who dream'd of being ſaved by their own good works, which they thought God would mercifully accept, and juſtifie them for, though they might need grains, or more than grains of allowance.

CXVIII.

Neither are we juſtified by *Faith* it ſelf, ſingly, and ſolely conſidured, or by the act of believing (or τὸ *credere*) as it is a good work, grace, or quality, but meerly as it is that *Inſtrument*, whereby we receive Chriſts Righteouſneſs, by which we are juſtified, or whereby we are united to Chriſt, and ſo become partakers of all his benefits. This is evident, 1. Becauſe the Apoſtle oppoſeth *Working*, and *Believing*, each to other, or rather, *Believing* to *Working*, in the matter of Juſtification, *Rom.* 4. 5. *But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that juſtifieth the ungodly, his Faith is counted for Righteouſneſs.* In this caſe we may ſay, *Fides quæ opus eſt juſtificat, non qua opus eſt.* That Faith which is a good work juſtifieth, but not as it is a good work, (as they ſay, *quæ viva*, not *qua viva.*) It is by Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs alone, as ours *Imputatively*, that we are juſtified, as by the *matter*, and *form* of our Righteouſneſs, and therefore Faith is but the *Inſtrument of Application*, as laying on is to a Plaiſter. 'Tis the Plaiſter that cureth, the laying on is but the applying of it, or the bringing of the ſore and the remedy together. If the Queſtion be put, *Who* ſhall be

Juſti-

Juſtified? I anſwer, *Believers*. But if it be put thus, *Why* is a Beliver Juſtified? or whence reſults the Juſtification of a Believer? or by what is he juſtified? I anſwer, By the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt applyed to him by *Faith*, *Act.* 13. *By him* (ſpeaking of Chriſt) *all that believe are juſtified.* And *Iſa.* 53. 11. *By the knowledg of him ſhall my righteous Servant* (that is Chriſt) *juſtifie many.* It is Chriſt that ſhall *juſtifie* (and by the Faith or *knowledg of himſelf* as only the inſtrumental cauſe) becauſe of the words following, *for he ſhall bear their Iniquities.* It is by *bearing their iniquities*, *i. e.* by ſuffering, and ſatisfying for their iniquities, (for ſo Chriſt is ſaid to have *borne our ſins in his body upon the the Croſs when he died for* them) that Chriſt ſhall juſtifie them who have knowledg of him, or who believe in him. So then it is not their *Believing*, accepted in the place of a perfect Righteouſneſs, for, and by which Chriſt Juſtifieth them, but by *bearing their iniquities*, by his own obedience to the death of the Croſs, on their behalf. It is not a poor mans acceptance of a great rich Match that doth enrich him, I ſay, the act of accepting, is not the the thing that doth it, or is the matter of his Eſtate, but the rich Match which is offered to him, and accepted by him.

There are Miracles in Scripture aſcribed to *Faith*, to which Faith could no otherwiſe concur, than as an *Inſtrument* engaging the power of God to work ſuch Miracles, or as a *Condition* to which the working of Miracles was promiſed, *Mat.* 16. 17. *Theſe ſigns ſhall follow tham that*

believe in my name, they ſhall caſt out Devils, ſpeak with new tongues. v. 18. *They ſhall take up Serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it ſhall not hurt them. They ſhall lay hands on the ſick, and they ſhall recover.* We read *Heb.* 11. 33. of thoſe *who through Faith ſtopped the mouths of Lions, quenched the violence of Fire.* v. 35. *Received their Dead raiſed to life again*, &c. Faith it ſelf could not do theſe things, unleſs it were omnipotent; therefore it could be but the *Inſtrument*, or Condition, by, or upon which the power of God was ingaged to do them, which may ſerve to illuſtrate what we have in hand. Look how Faith concurr'd to the curing of that Cripple ſpoken of, *Acts* 3. 16. *His name, through Faith in his name, hath made this man ſtrong.* In like manner doth it concur to the *juſtifying* of a ſinner, *viz.* as a meer applying Inſtrument, or Condition; by means of which, and with reſpect to which, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt becomes imputed to us, for our Juſtification. It was the Name, or Power of Chriſt, which cured that Cripple; ſo 'tis Chriſt, and his Righteouſneſs which juſtifieth a ſinner, but then it is through *Faith*, as the *Inſtrument* receiving, and applying the ſame.

CXVII.

Faith is a Grace by it ſelf, diſtinct from *fear* of God, *Love*, *ſelf denyal*, &c. and as ſuch, it acteth when it is *inſtrumental* in *Juſtification*, or doth concur thereto, either as an *Inſtrument*, or a *Condition* (call it either). When the *Apoſtle* denieth

defineth *Faith*, *Heb.* 11. 1. saying, *Faith is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen*, he gives that description of that one grace, and not of all the rest. *Faith* and *Charity* are not the same grace; for the *Apostle* saith, *now abideth Faith, Hope, and Charity, these three, but the greatest of these is Charity.* If they be not distinct, how are they called three? or how could *Charity* be said to be the *greatest*, if *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity* be all one? Is the same thing greater than it self at the same time? Moreover, *Faith* shall hereafter be done away, that is swallowed up in *Vision*, but *Charity never faileth*, as the Apostle speaketh, *v.* 8. Now that which faileth, and that which shall never fail, cannot be the same. Moreover, *Faith* is said *to work by love*, which implies, that they are two distinct things. Also, *Faith* is said to be *made perfect by love*, *i. e.* demonstrated to be perfect, which sheweth it is not the same thing. I might add *Faith*, and *Repentance* are not the same, witness that expression, *Repentance toward God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.* Faith is causal to several other Graces. They differ as *causes*, and *effects*, therefore they cannot be the same thing, *ex gr. Faith* is the cause of Christian Patience. *He that believes maketh not haste*, 2 Cor. 4. 16. *For which cause we faint not*, there was their *Patience.* Now that *Faith* was the cause of it may be proved by *v.* 18. *While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen.* Now to be the evidence of things not seen, or to look at and to reallize unseen things, is the nature, and work

of *Faith*. *Faith* is ſpoken of but as one fruit of the Spirit amongſt many, *Gal.* 5. 22. where St. *Paul* enumerates *Love*, *Long ſuffering*, *Gentleneſs*, *Goodneſs*, *Meekneſs*, *Temperance*, &c. were theſe one, and the ſame, ſurely they would not be preſented to us under ſo many ſeveral names, and denominations, &c. *Faith* is not the name of a Chriſtians whole *Panoply*, or ſpiritual Armor, but of one picce thereof. That indeed is called the *Shield*, Eph. 6. 16. but *Truth the Girdle*. *Righteouſneſs the Breſtplate*, and *the Helmet*, *the hope of Salvation*. In 2 *Theſ.* 1. 4, are theſe words, *We glory for your Patience nnd Faith*. and *v.* 3. *Your Faith groweth*, *and your Charity aboundeth*. and in 1 *Tim.* 1. 5. *The end of the Command is Love*, *out of a pure heart and Faith*, where *Faith* and *Love* are ſpoken of as two things, *Faith* as the *cauſe*, and *Love* as the *effect*, *Love* out of *Faith*, &c. For fear of tiring you, I ſhall quote but one text more, to this purpoſe, 1 *Tim.* 1. 11. *Follow after Righteouſneſs*, *Godlineſs*, *Faith*, *Love*, *Paeience*, *Meekneſs*. Would the Apoſtle have given ſo many names to one and the ſame thing? or do's it not enough appear by their being ſo conſtantly ſpoken of in Scripture as diſtinct, that they are not the ſame? That *Juſtifying Faith* involves all other Graces, and is the name of all Graces in one, cannot at all be prov'd by the Apoſtle *James* his diſcourſe of Juſtification by works: For St. *James* doth not mention any prrticular *Grace*, but *Works* in general, as externally, and viſibly practiſed. Had he ſaid *Abraham was juſtified not only* by Faith, but alſo by

by *Love*, *ſelf denial*, *Obedience*, &c. there had been ſome colour for ſuch an Aſſertion. But now there is none.

CXVIII.

Seeing *Faith* is almoſt every where elſe in Scripture taken for a Grace by it's ſelf, diſtinct from the reſt, and other Graces ſpoken of as diſtinct one from another, it can at no hand be proved, that where *Faith* is mentioned with reference to *Juſtification*, or we ſaid to be Juſtified by, or through Faith, by *Faith* is meant all ſorts of Grace, or the whole Chain of Graces, whereas indeed *Faith* is but one link of that Chain.

CXIX.

If *Faith* it's being the only Inſtrumental cauſe, or the only condition of Juſtification cannot be evaded, by ſaying that by Faith is meant the *Goſpel*, or by *Faith* is meant *Faith*, and *good works* together; or by *Faith* is meant not one ſingle Grace, but all comprized under that Name: Nor yet by ſaying that when works are excluded from *Juſtification*, we muſt alwayes underſtand it of works either as *meritorious*, or as *Perfect*, or as *works before Regeneration*, or as works of the *Ceremonial* Law only, or as works of the *Law*, not *of the Goſpel*, or as works *inſincere*, and only materially, and extrinſically good: I ſay, If *works*, as *works* be excluded from Juſtification, and none of the other evaſions will hold water (as hath been ſhewed)

then we are not juſtified by our real, inward holineſs, or ſincere Obedience to the Goſpel, but by *Faith* alone, as the only *Inſtrument* whereby we receive, and apply to our ſelves the Righteouſneſs of our Saviour, *&c.* And if our Obedience to the Goſpel, though ſincere, cannot be proved to be ſo much as the *Inſtrument*, or *Condition* of our Juſtification, much leſs the matter of our Righteouſneſs before God, or that which in God's Court *of* Chancery (as they call it) is accepted inſtead of a perfect Righteonſneſs for our *Juſtification*, &c.

CXX.

As for the Popiſh Diſtinction of a *firſt* and *ſecond Juſtification*; to the latter of which they ſay good works doth concurr. I think there is nothing in it that will ſatisfie any good Proteſtant, or any rational man of an unprejudiced mind. For by our *firſt Juſtification* they do underſtand our being made Holy, and Godly of unholy, and ungodly. Now, that Proteſtants do call not *Juſtification*, but *Sanctification*. By our ſecond Juſtification they underſtand our being made of Holy, more Holy, and of Godly, more Godly. This Proteſtants deny to be truly called *Juſtification*, and do call it our *growth in Grace*, or progreſs in *Sanctification*, and doubtleſs ſo it is. But for a Perſons being really juſtified more than once, we have no ground or foot ſteps in Scripture. Therefore though it be a Truth that a Believer by abounding in good works, doth increaſe in Grace, and Holineſs

(for

(for repeated Acts do ſtrengthen their reſpective Habits) yet that by doing good works, they do acquire a *ſecond Juſtification*, is a moſt ungrounded notion, and muſt ſuppoſe that either the *firſt juſtification* may be loſt, and a *ſecond* obtained, and if ſo, why may there not be twenty *juſtifications* as well as two? or elſe that a Believer is not virtually juſtified from all his ſins at once (which our Divines do generally affirm that he is) Now, if there be no *ſecond juſtification*, the concurrence of good works thereunto, is a notion that falls to the ground. For, *non entis nulla eſt affectio.*

CXXI.

The denying of Juſtification to be by our own inherent Righteouſneſs, accepted as if it were perfect, or inſtead of the perfect Righteouſneſs of the Law, and aſſerting of Juſtification to be by the only Righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt apprehended by *Faith* alone, doth greatly tend to keep Sinners humble, and to exclude all boaſting (which God aimeth to do) when they ſhall conſider that that whereby they are juſtified is not in themſelves, this being certain that we are more apt to be proud of what is ſuppoſed to be in us, than of what is *imputed* to us. As a Debtor hath leſs to boaſt of when the payment of his *Surety* is imputed to him for his diſcharge, than if by his induſtry he had procured ſomething to pay for himſelf, although the ſtock had been freely beſtowed on him by the *Surety*. 'Tis evident by the Apoſtles words, that that can

be

be no true notion of the way of God's juſtifying a ſinner which doth leave any room, or place, or pretence for boaſting, *Rom.* 4. 2. *If* Abraham *were juſtified by works, he hath whereof to boaſt* (or glory) *q. d.* That is Argument enough to prove that *Abraham* was not Juſtified by works. He adds as a *minor* propoſition or aſſumption, *But not before God*, meaning, But he had no cauſe to glory, or to boaſt before God. *Ergo.* He was not juſtified by works.

CXXII.

Our Graces and good works, though from henceforth they ſhould be perfect, and intire, lacking nothing, would not be able to ſatisfie God for our *Original ſin*, and our Actual ſins that are *paſt*, and to diſcharge us from the guilt of them, for we cannot pay one debt with another, and our beſt Obedience is a daily debt; much leſs then can *imperfect* Obedience to the Goſpel, though ſincere, juſtifie us, or be the matter of our Righteouſneſs before God.

CXXIII.

Our Juſtification is as free to us (though 'twere not ſo to Chriſt) as any Pardon ever was to a Traytor. Now, unto a Pardon freely given there is nothing required but the hearty acceptance of it upon the terms of promiſing to be a Faithful Subject for time to come, or ſo. Now, though ſuch a Pardon coſt a man nothing, and is abundantly ſufficient for his diſcharge, yet muſt he come and plead this Pardon in open Court,

Court, he muſt produce it, and inſiſt upon it, before his Judge, in arreſt of Judgment, that the Sentence denounced againſt him may not be Executed. A Traytor that is ſo acquitted, cannot be ſaid to be acquitted by his willingneſs to accept of a pardon, or to produce it in Court when obtained (for what Malefactor is not willing to do theſe two things?) But by the *Pardon* it's ſelf it is that a Traytor is diſcharged, though he cannot have the benefit of his Pardon, if it be only tendered, unleſs it be alſo *accepted*, and pleaded by him. Now, to accept, and plead his Pardon, when nothing elſe but that is required of him, renders it no leſs *free*, than if he might have had it without accepting, or at leaſtwiſe, without pleading of it. But were he for his *Pardon*, and in order to the procurement thereof, to be a Servant all the dayes of his Life, that would alter the caſe, and make his *pardon unfree*.

Believing, or *Faith* is the Acceptance of our Pardon upon God's terms, but *juſtification* by works, reſembleth the laſt inſtance, *viz.* of one who muſt work hard all the dayes of his Life, to pay his Debt, or elſe be caſt into Priſon, *&c.*

CXXIV.

In ſaying that *Faith* is the *Inſtrumental* cauſe, or *Condition* of Juſtification, we aſcribe much more to it than if we had called it only *cauſa ſine qua non*. For *cauſa ſine qua non* do's *nihil ponere in eſſe*, it produceth nothing; no effect doth neceſ-

neceſſarily follow upon it. The pooreſt begget hath that in him without which no man can be a Prince, *viz.* Humane Nature. For to be a man is a *cauſa ſine qua non*, of being a Prince, yet how far from being a Prince is a poor Begger? Every Virgin that Liv'd in that time when Chriſt was look'd for, had a *cauſa ſine qua non*, of being the Mother of Chriſt. For none but a Female, and a Virgin, could be that, yet reſpective to the decree of God none but the Virgin *Mary* could be that.

But a Condition is ſuch a thing, as when it is performed, produceth a real effect, *viz.* intitleth to the performance of the promiſe, which was ſuſpended upon it. Alſo an *Inſtrumental Cauſe*, which is ſuch in Fact, or in *facto eſſe*, produceth the effect. For no man can be ſaid to be the Inſtrument of doing ſuch a thing untill the thing be done. A cauſe in *facto eſſe* ſuppoſeth it's *effect* to be ſo. For nothing is actually a cauſe that doth not actually effect ſomething, *&c.* Faith is ſo an *Inſtrument*, and ſo a *Condition* of Juſtification that whenſoever a ſinner believeth he is thereupon juſtified immediately in the ſame Inſtant.

CXXV.

There is no danger in owning Holineſs, and good works to be *cauſæ ſine quibus non* of Juſtification, becauſe a *cauſa ſine qua non* is as remote a thing as can be thought of, and do's not at all intitle what in that ſenſe is called a *Cauſe* to the *effect*. For the Law of God is a *cauſa ſine qua non*

non of *ſin*. For had there *been no Law, there had been no tranſgreſſion*. Yea, God himſelf who can as ſoon ceaſe to be God, as be the Author of ſin, yet may be ſaid to be a *cauſa ſine qua non* of ſin in reference to his making of men, and Angels. For had God Created no intelligent Creatures, there could have been no ſin; for ſuch Creatures only are capable of ſinning. But ſhall we therefore make God the Author of ſin? God forbid.

Privation is a *cauſa ſine qua non* of *Generation*, yet Philoſophers deny it to be a cauſe truly ſo called.

One calls *cauſa ſine qua non*, *cauſam ſtolidam*, and well he may, for there is little reaſon to be given why it ſhould be called a cauſe, ſith the Definition of a cauſe doth not agree to it, *Cauſa eſt cujus vires eſt*. A cauſe is that by virtue, or means whereof, ſome other thing is, or is produced. But nothing is produced by virtue of a *cauſa ſine qua non*. There may be a hundred *cauſæ ſine quibus non*, that a man may have of his being a *Lord Mayor of* London, if he had not been *ens*, or had a being, he could not have been that, without he had a *vegetative ſoul*, or without he had had a *ſenſitive ſoul*, and a *rational ſoul*, and a *Body* that had not been monſtrous, the right ſhape of a man, without he had Lived in *Europe*, yea, Lived in *England*, yea, Lived in *London*, yea, had been a Free Man of *London*. yea, been poſſeſt of a viſible good Eſtate, *&c.* (and twenty things more) he could never have been *Lord Mayor of* London. And yet will

will any man say that any of these things were the *causes* of his being *Lord Mayor?*

CXXVI.

Yet owning Holiness, and every grace to be (as they are) causes without which there is no Justification, though it doth not advance other Graces to a parity with Faith, or to an equal influence upon the Justification of a sinner, to that which Faith hath yet is an effectual bar (if right-by considered) against *presuming* to live unrighteously, and unholily, upon the account of our being justified by a righteousness without us. For what is any man the better, or what more encouragement hath he to sin, though it be so that we are not justified by every sort of Grace, but by *Faith* alone (as the only *Instrument* where by we apprehend the righteousness of Christ, and the only condition to which the Promise of Justification is made) sith they that say so, do acknowledge that *Repentance*, *Love*, *Self-denyal*, and all other Graces, must concur in the *person Justified*, though not to his *Justification*; or that we cannot be *justified* without the presence of those, though by these we are not justified, but by *Faith* alone: yea that the person justified cannot be saved without doing of good works, if he hath space of time for them (which the Thief on the Cross had not) no more than a Sum of Money that is due, can be received without giving an *Acquittance* for it, when it is demanded, and insisted on.

CXXVII.

CXXVII.

They give the trueſt, and beſt account of the Doctrine of Juſtification, who ſo ſtate it as neither to deprive God of the glory of his free Grace, nor to deter man from his duty, in point of ſincere obedience; ſo as *Juſtification* may not be confounded with *Sanctification* (as by the Papiſts it is, as if it were the ſame thing) as conſiſting in righteouſneſs not imputed, but infuſed, nor yet *Sanctificaiion* be excluded, and rendered needleſs by the Doctrine of *Juſtificaiion* as it is ſtated, but *Imputed Righteouſneſs* ſo confined to the uſe for which it is deſigned of God, that *Righteouſneſs inherent*, or *implanted* may be owned as indiſpenſably neceſſary, though not for the ſame with *Imputed*, yet for other great ends and uſes, *&c.* By taking care of the latter, we ſhall arm our ſelves againſt *Antinomians*, and *Libertines*; of the former, againſt *Papiſts*, and *Socinians*, &c. The account we have given of Juſtiffcation by *Faith* alone, hath to the beſt of our knowledg, been ſo ſtated, and hath therefore a great character of Truth upon it.

CXXVIII.

The aſſerting of new Terms, Phraſes, and Modes of ſpeaking, in ſo great a Doctrine as that of *Juſtification*, though nothing but ſome more accuracy in ſtating the old Doctrine concerning it were intended, has been, and is, of dangerous conſequence, eſpecially when the old terms, and expreſſions, whereby it hath been

been competently underſtood formerly, are cri'd down, and exploded. I ſay it is of dangerous conſequence, becauſe men are thereby led to to think, that all that which they have heard concerniug *Juſtification* formerly, was falſe, though the Inventors of theſe new expreſſions, they themſelves do not think ſo, or whatſoever they think, by their new Phraſes, they lead the people into Fundamental Errors, being deceived themſelves, and deceiving others, I ſay deceiving, and being deceived.

CXXIX.

Mr. *Durham*, on the *Revelation*, hath a worthy paſſage to this purpoſe, *p.* 236. *We are perſwaded* (ſaith he) *that the reflecting on many worthy men, the obſcuring of the troden path by new Queſtions, and Objections, the confounding of Readers by propoſing, as it were, of a different ſtrain of the Covenant from what formerly hath been Preached, the giving an open door to men to propoſe new draughts in all things, and that not in expreſſions only, but alſo in Fundamental things, ſhall be more prejudicial to edification, than the bringing forth of this ſhall be uſeful: For if by this all the former Doctrines of Juſtification be enervated, where were we all till now? If it ſtand ſo that the followers thereof may attain Heaven, what is the uſe of this ſo full a new model, with ſo much profeſſed danger in, and diſſatisfaction with the former? Will it not be welcom to Papiſts* (ſaith he) *to have Proteſtants ſpeaking in their terms, and homologating them in condemning the former language of the moſt eminent Reformers?*

CXXX.

CXXX.

The opening of Faiths peculiar concurring for the Application of Chriſt his Righteouſneſs in the Covenant of Grace, is a buſineſs of great uſe and concernment, *&c.* into which we may receive ſome light by conſidering how, and in what ſenſe, *Faith* is and may be ſaid to be a *Condition of the Covenant of Grace*, or of *Juſtification.*

CXXXI.

Covenants are either ſuch as meer entering into them doth entitle to the benefits comprehended in them, as in the Marriage-Covenant, entry thereinto intitleth the Wife to the Husband, and all that is his: Sometimes again the Relation muſt not only be entered, but alſo the terms thereof actually performed, before there be a right to the thing promiſed. Thus if *Jacob* Covenant with *Laban* to ſerve him ſeven years, that he may Marry his daughter, at the expiration thereof, he enters into the Relation of a Servant preſently, but his reward becomes not due till the end of his ſervice: Or if a Maſter Covenants to make his Servant free at the end of eight years, in caſe he ſhall do him good and faithful ſervice, though he be now his Covenant Servant, yet his Fredom, the reward of his Service, will not become due to him till he hath actually ſerv'd his Maſter, ſo many years, *&c.*

CXXXII.

As there are two ſorts of Covenants (as hath been ſaid) ſo there are two ſorts of Conditions of a Covenant, or Covenants: For 1. The words *Condition of a Covenant*, are ſometimes taken more largely; for all the duties that are required of one in that Relation: And ſo a Wives dutifulneſs to her Husband after Marriage, may be called Conditions of the *Marriage Covenant*. Sometimes a Condition is taken more ſtrictly, and *Formally*; that is, for ſuch a thing as makes up the Relation, and entitles one to, and enſtates him in the Priviledges Covenanted. So Formal conſenting in Marriage is the Condition. And a Sons actual accepting of the aſſured Adoption, and engaging himſelf to be dutiful, do enſtate him in the priviledge of a Son, although he hath not actually perform'd all that he is engaged to. And in this reſpect the actual performing of ſuch duties, is rather the duty of one in ſuch a Relation, than the Condition required to the up-making of it.

CXXXIII.

There is difference betwixt the Priviledges, of a Covenant which flow from it; as ſuch, and to all in ſuch a Relation, (Thus all Wives, as ſuch, have intereſt in their Husbands) and thoſe Priviledges of a Covenant, which are but conditionally promiſed even to them that are within thoſe Relations. So what a Husband promiſeth to give his Wife upon condition of her being

ing a Faithful Wife, depends not upon her Relation as a Wife, but upon the continuing faithful. An Adopted Son cannot plead actual poſſeſſion of the Inheritance, though he be a Son, till that time come that was appointed by the Father, or till he perform ſomething call'd for in the right of Adoption, (which is inſinuated,) *Gal.* 4. 1, 2.

CXXXIV.

What hath been ſaid may help to ſhew us in what ſenſe Works may be called the Condition of the Covenant of Grace, and in what ſenſe Faith only. If we take *Condition* largely, and materially for whatſoerer is required of one in Covenant; ſo Works may be called the Condition of the Covenant. Even as a Wife or Son, their performing Cenjugal, or Filial Duties to a Husband, or Father, may be called Conditions of Marriage, and Adoption: Yet if we conſider the Condition of the Covenant of grace ſtrictly and *formally*, for that which doth actually intereſs one in, or entitle him to Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and maketh him a ſon, that is Faith properly taken as it doth unite with Chriſt *Joh.* 1. 12. becauſe it is impoſſible to conceive one to believe in Chriſt but he muſt be conceived to have title to him, as a Wife to her Huſband, or a Son to his Father. And ſo he cannot be conceived to be a true Believer but he muſt be juſtified; becauſe to have intereſt in Chriſt, and his Righteouſneſs, cannot be ſeparated from Juſtification.

CXXXV.

The *Covenant of Grace* is not like the Covenant betwixt a Husbandman and his Labourer, for his hire, which preſuppoſeth working, and ſo the performance of it muſt go before the Servant, or Labourer can plead any thing upon the Agreement: But it is like a Marriage Covenant, or *free Adoption*, which doth indeed infer duties to follow in the reſpect aforeſaid, and doth imply an ingagement to perform them, but doth not preſuppoſe the actual performance thereof before any right can be pleaded by ſuch Relations, but only conſenting and ingaging to the ſame. The *Covenant of Works* is in Scripture compared to that Covenant which is betwixt a Maſter and his hired Labourer; hence the reward is called *Debt*, or *Hire*; becauſe the performing of the Conditions, of Holineſs, and Obedience was neceſſarily preſuppoſed unto having right to the great priviledges of that Covenant. For though *Adam* was in covenant with God at firſt, yet could he not claim life by vertue thereof, till he had continued in obedience to the commands, and actually performed the ſame, as Servauts muſt do before they can plead for their hire. Again, The *Covenant of Grace* is compared to *Free Adoption*, and to *Marriage* betwixt Man, and Wife, not becauſe the *Covenant of Grace* requires not Holineſs, or Works, but becauſe it doth not require them actually to precede a perſons title to all the priviledges Covenanted, and doth freely entitle him to the

ſame

ſame upon his entery therein, as a Wife is entitled to what is her Husbands upon her Marriage with him, although afterwards ſhe be to perform the Duties of the Relation, rather as duties called for by it, than as *Conditions* of it, *&c.*

CXXXVI.

The difference betwixt the *Covenant of Works*, and *Covenant of Grace* lieth not in this, that the one requireth Works *perfectly holy*, as the Condition thereof, and the other Evangelical works, not *perfectly holy*: becauſe ſo there were not the ſame Law for ordering holineſs to us which they had, nor the ſame abſolute pattern of Holineſs for our Copy, *viz.* God's Holineſs calling us to *be holy as he is holy*; nor were defects in reference to our perfect Holineſs, ſinful under the *Covenant of Grace*, if perfection were not required therein; all which are falſe, beſide that ſo it were ſtill of *works*. But the difference lieth in this, that our *working* is not to be the ground of our Inheritance, nor actually to precede our Righteouſneſs, (as in the Covenant of works was neceſſary) but *believing*, and *conſenting* only.

CXXXVII.

The difference betwixt the *Covenant of Works*, and the *Covenant of Grace*, may be conceived thus: Suppoſe a Debter Sued for his own Debt ſhould either plead no Debt, or that he had paid it, or would pay it; this is the *Covenant of Works*. Again, the *Covenant of Grace*, is as a

Debtor, acknowledging Debts, but being unable to pay, pleadeth only the Surety's payment, and expecteth to be abſolved on that account; and not as if by a Surety's intervening he had had all the Debt forgiven him, to ſo much, or had a new bargain given him, for a penny yearly, or a Pepper-corn in the place of a thouſand Talents; and in a word, ſo much down, and that for Gold, Oare of Gold ſhould be accepted. For if ſo, It would be the ſame kind of Condition, and ſo the ſame Covenant in kind. For, *Majus & minus non variant ſpeciem.*

CXXXVIII.

Whereas the Goſpel requireth *perfect Obedience* (as hath been proved) as truly as the *Covenant of Works* did, were that *perfect Obedience*, the Condition of it, without which the benefits thereof cannot be enjoyed, there would be no difference at all betwixt the *Covenant of Grace*, and the *Covenant of Works*, foraſmuch as both did require *works*, yea and *perfect works* as the condition thereof.

CXXXIX.

It may be farther evidenced, that not ſincere, though imperfect Obedience, is the Condition of the *Covenant of Grace*, and of our Juſtification, but *Faith*, becauſe when the *Apoſtle* oppoſeth the Righteouſneſs of Law and Goſpel, he oppoſeth not as it were 1000 Talents to a penny, or one ſort of works to another; but the Righteouſ-

teouſneſs of Chriſt, or to be found in him to all kind of Works whatſoever, *Phil.* 3. 9. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Gal.* 3. 12. *And to have the Righteouſneſs of Faith, and the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and the Righteouſneſs by Faith,* are ever one and the ſame thing, and are ſtill oppoſed to *Works.*

CXL.

Moreover, the Sinners charge is not this, that he wants his penny, or pepper-corn, but that he hath broken the Law, his Righteouſneſs therefore muſt be ſuch as doth meet that charge, *Rom.* 8. 34. And ſo it muſt be ſuch a Righteouſneſs as may be equivalent, at leaſt to his own fulfilling the Law, or his having ſatisfied the penalty thereof.

CXLI.

When we ſay *Faith* is the *Condition* of the New Covenant, and of our *Juſtification* (which is one great priviledge thereof) we mean, that our having right to God's promiſes ſupplyeth that room which *Conditions* do in men's mutual bargains; wherein when one promiſeth ſomething on ſuch a Condition, the performance of that Condition doth turn the conditional promiſe into an abſolute right to him that hath performed it. And ſo *Faith* is the Condition upon which the Title to that great promiſe, *viz.* God's being our God doth depend. *Faith* hath obtained that Name in reſpect of the place which God hath put it into in his Covenant, and ſo it flows from his extrinſick Ordination, *Durham,*

CXLII.

But when *Faith* is called the Inſtrumental cauſe of our Juſtification the intrinſick manner of it's Acting is reſpected. For though it be from the Spirit, with other Graces, and they be not ſeparated, yet hath it a peculiar aptitude to *look to Chriſt*, *receive him*, *apprehend*, and *eat* him, take hold, and reſt on him, &c. That is, expect Salvation from him, for ſo the Jews were ſaid to *reſt* in the Law who expected *Juſtification* by it, *Rom.* 2.

CXLIII.

It is a Truth greatly to be obſerved, that for attaining of *Juſtification* by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, *Faith* doth peculiarly concur in the apprehending thereof, and working thereon, otherwiſe than other Graces can be ſaid to do, *Durham* 240.

CXLIV.

The fore-going Propoſition will not ſeem ſtrange if we conſider, That to be Juſtified by Chriſt, and by Faith, or by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and by the Righteouſneſs of Faith, are ſtill one in Scripture, even then where that concurrence which is allowed to Faith is deny'd to all other things, which ſheweth, that Faith concurreth peculiarly, and that it juſtifieth by obtaining Juſtification through Chriſt. 2. As Faith of Miracles did concur for the obtaining of a particular benefit, ſo doth ſaving Faith for attain-

attaining of Juſtification. But Faith of Miracles did concur Inſtrumentally for health; for 'tis ſaid, ſome had Faith to be healed. *i. e.* to receive virtue from Chriſt to heal them, which others had not. And accordingly the effects are attributed both to their *Faith*, and to Chriſt's power. Therefore it may be ſo here, *viz.* Juſtification may flow from Faith, as the *Inſtrumental Cauſe*, and from Chriſt's Righteouſneſs as the *Meritorious*.

CXLV.

Works are not the *Inſtrument*, or *Condition* of our Juſtification, whether works before Converſion, for they were not acceptable, nor works after Converſion, for they are after *Juſtification*; and ſo can be no cauſe thereof.

CXLVI.

If any ſhall object and ſay, that neither Faith before we are Sanctified can Juſtifie us Inſtrumentally, nor Faith after we are Sanctified (for the reaſons alleaged againſt Works) I anſwer, It is neither Faith before, nor after our being Sanctified, or Converted, that is the Inſtrument of our Juſtification, but that *Faith* which enters into us into a juſtified eſtate, and it cannot be conceived either *before*, or *after*, being an inſtantaneous Act, as ſolemn conſenting in Marriage is not before, nor after, as it conſtituteth Marriage, but inſtantly.

CXLVII.

CXLVII.

Some to make way for Works being a Condition of Juſtification as well as Faith, do ſay that Juſtification is not an inſtantaneous, but a continued Act: but in the ſenſe they do affirm it is falſe. For it cannot be ſaid that Believers do continue in being *admitted into* a juſtified Eſtate, or that by a continued Act the Lord is ſtill admitting them, as it inferreth *non-admiſſion*, or an imperfect admiſſion, which is the ſenſe in which they affirm it: but all that can truly be ſaid is, that God continueth to *Juſtifie*, or that the Act of their admiſſion into that Eſtate is a continuing Act. As a Man is married but once, to one Woman, but though his conſent to Marry be given at once, and the ſame inſtant they are Man and Wife; yet that an Inſtantareous Act of his in declaring his conſent to Marry, abideth for ever, as long as they two ſhall Live.

CXLVIII.

That Juſtification is no continued Act, I prove thus. 1. A Sinner upon his Believing is inſtantly juſtified and freed from the curſe, and inſtated into Friendſhip with God, *Ergo*. Juſtification is no continued Act. 2. Our being admitted into the Covenant of Grace as to a right to the ſaving Bleſſings promiſed therein is no continued, but an inſtantaneous Act. *Ergo*. Juſtification is ſo. For they who are ſo in Covenant are Juſtified, *&c.* 3. A Believer is not partly

partly under the Curſe, and partly under Grace; partly ſaved, and partly damn'd; partly abſolv'd, and partly condemn'd; therefore being certainly under Grace, and abſolution in part, (for elſe he could not be ſaid to be juſtified at all) he muſt be altogether ſo. 4. A Believer, for that he is ſuch, or as, and as ſoon as he is ſuch, hath a Righteouſneſs that can abide the Trial in Juſtice. Therefore Juſtification cannot be a continued Act. For if the Juſtification of a Sinner were but a perfecting, it could not be ſaid that he had an Actual, perfect Righteouſneſs (as that of Chriſt imputed to him is) but only that it were a perfecting.

CXLIX.

To ſay that Works are a Condition of the Covenant, or of *Juſtification*, were to confound the *Covenant of Grace*, and the *Covenant of Works*. Now, the Apoſtle doth directly oppoſe theſe. *The Righteouſneſs of the Law ſaith on this wiſe, The man that doth theſe things ſhall live in them.* And the Righteouſneſs of Faith is holden forth as oppoſite to that, and ſo cannot be ſaid to conſiſt in doing of works, *Rom.* 10. 5, 6. *Gal.* 3. 12. The *Covenant of works* is ſo called, in reſpect of the formality of the Condition thereof, *viz. Doing*, that is, the Righteouſneſs which we our ſelves do, *Titus* 3. 5. *Not by works of Righteouſneſs which we have done*, &c.

CL.

CL.

Faith is oppoſed to works as the *Condition of the Covenant*, or of *Juſtification* not as conſidered in it's ſelf, but with Reſpect to it's object Chriſt. Works inherent in us, and performed by us are call'd for in the *Covenant of works*, as the Righteouſneſs thereof, and as the only ground upon which we can expect to be juſtified by it. Again, by the Covenant of Grace Chriſt's Righteouſneſs without us received by Faith is only admitted as a Right and ground of Juſtification. 'Tis evident that Faith is ſo to be underſtood, *Rom.* 10. 5, 6. *Gal.* 3. 10, 11, 12. For the Righteouſneſs ſpoken of, *Rom.* 10. 3, 4. (which is the Righteouſneſs of Faith, and is oppoſed to our Righteouſneſs) is *Chriſt the end of the Law for Righteouſneſs to all that believe.* So it is alſo, *Gal.* 3. And it is obſervable that in both theſe Chapters the difference of the Condition of the Covenant of Works, and of Grace is inſiſted, on to plead the neceſſity of a Righteouſneſs without us in oppoſition to our own: and ſo Faith muſt be the Condition of the Covenant of Grace as it acteth, or reſteth on that.

CLI.

We cannot aſſent to the diſtinction which ſome give, *viz.* That Chriſt is our *Legal Righteouſneſs*, that is, that by him we have ſatisfied the Covenant of Works, he having pay'd in our Name; but *Faith and Obedience* are our *Evan-*

Evangelick Righteouſneſs; that is, as he hath procur'd a new grant of Life upon theſe eaſie terms, in the Covenant of Grace, and ſo as by performing thereof we may come to have right to what he hath purchaſed in ſatisfying the firſt Covenant.

CLII.

I ſay, we cannot aſſent to the fore-ſaid diſtinction. 1. Becauſe it doth make two Righteouſneſſes in Juſtification, and one of them to be the means for attaining the other, whereas the Goſpel Righteouſneſs is but one in it's ſelf, by Faith apprehended and made ours. Chriſt is our *Legal Righteouſneſs*, as the Law's charge is ſatisfied by him: and he is our *Evangelick Righteouſneſs*, as the mean of anſwering the Law is propoſed to us in the Goſpel, and for us, upon the condition of Faith, accepted by the ſame, without which Chriſt had never been our *Legal Righteouſneſs*. But if we conſider the *Law righteouſneſs* ſtrictly, as it requireth *Satisfaction* from the very Party, ſo Chriſt is not our Legal Righteouſneſs, but our Evangelick Righteouſneſs, ſeeing no other way but by the Goſpel we have acceſs to him.

CLIII.

To ſuch as do affirm that Chriſt hath procured Faith (in that large ſenſe as involving Goſpel Obedience) to be accepted as our Righteouſneſs, I would anſwer, 1. That were not to make Chriſt our immediate Righteouſneſs, but only

only to procure that such works should be accepted, and the former Covenant mitigated, but not in its Nature changed. 2. That overturneth the *Imputation* of Christ's Righteousness as our immediate Righteousness, and so puts upon being found not in Christ's Righteousness, but in our own, contrary to *Paul*, *Phil.* 3. 9.

CLIV.

Concerning *Faith*, it is modestly, and safely expressed, that *Faith*, at most, is but the condition on which Christ becomes our Righteousness; and so *Faith* it self properly cannot be our Righteousness. When *Faith* is called the condition of the Covenant, or our Righteousness, it doth not imply that it is properly imputed, but it shews to whom, and upon what terms Christ's Righteousness is imputed, or how a Sinner may have access to be justified by it.

CLV.

Faith when it is called a condition of the covenant ought alwayes to be taken strictly, as it receiveth Christ, and by that manner of Acting is differenced from all other Graces, and Works.

CLVI.

Faith strictly taken cannot be rightly conceiv'd but as looking to Christ's Righteousness, the object thereof, even as we cannot conceive a consent which constituteth a Marriage, without

out reſpect to the party conſented to: or as we cannot conceive looking to the brazen Serpent, as the condition, or mean, by which health was gotten, but with reſpect to the object thereof, the Serpent, and the ground preceding, *viz.* God's appointment; without which, a look ſimply conſidered was of no ſuch virtue.

CLVII.

To them that ſhall ſay, If Faith properly taken be the condition of the *Covenant of Grace*, and hath in that ſucceeded in the room that works had in the *Covenant of Works*, it therefore muſt be our *Evangelical* Righteouſneſs; as *Works* were our *Legal* Righteouſneſs. I anſwer; That Faith is never to be taken without implying the Object, Chriſt, or without reſpect to it's proper aptitude for receiving him. And ſo *Believe and thou ſhalt be ſaved*, implyeth ſtill this, Receive Chriſt and reſt on his Righteouſneſs, or ſubmit to Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and accept of him for that end, that he may be Righteouſneſs to thee, and thou ſhalt be ſaved. Our Evangelick Righteouſneſs whereby we are abſolved is in Chriſt, not in our ſelves, 2 *Cor.* 5.21. as the ſin for which he was ſentenced was in us, not in him.

CLVIII.

The diſproving of Juſtification to be a continued Act, plainly proveth Faith and Works joyned together not to be the Condition thereof. For if ſo, no man could be juſtified till the cloſe of

of his life, or till he had perſevered in Faith and Holineſs to the end of his days. Now if Juſtification be an *Inſtantaneous* act (like that of a Judge giving ſentence of Abſolution) then good works cannot precede our Juſtification, and conſequently not be the Inſtruments of it. True it is, God continueth to pronounce Believers Juſtified to their dying day, and the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs unto them never ceaſeth as to the virtue of it; but it cannot be ſaid that God doth continue to change Believers from a ſtate of Enmity to a ſtate of Friendſhip, which is the true notion of Juſtification.

CLIX.

The way of Juſtification more clearly expreſſed under the Goſpel by theſe expreſſions, *Believe in the Lord Jeſus and you ſhall be ſaved*, may be ſomewhat illuſtrated by comparing it with the Typical expreſſions under the Law. Now the expreſſions of the Old Teſtament run thus: *When a man ſinneth he ſhall bring an Offering*, &c. *and he ſhall put his hand upon the head of the Burnt-offering, and it ſhall be accepted for him, to make Atonement for him*, &c. In thoſe words God did propoſe ſomething as a Righteouſneſs for a ſinner, which was to be accepted for him; yet none will ſay that it was the external Sacrifice it ſelf that was to be accepted for ſuch, nor that it was the Faith of the Offerer alone, that was ſo accepted: For then there needed no Sacrifice, but it behoved to be the thing Typefied by that Sacrifice, *viz.* the Sacrifice of Chriſt look'd

look'd to by the Faith of the Offerer, that was ſo accepted. Yet the external Sacrifices in the Old Teſtament, are as expreſsly ſaid to be accepted for a ſinner's Juſtification, or an Atonement for him, as Faith is ſaid to be counted for Righteouſneſs in the New. And as it cannot be ſaid that by vertue of Chriſt's Satisfaction, and the Covenant with him, it was procured that ſuch Performances, and Sacrifices, ſhould be accepted of themſelves as the perſon's immediate Evangelical Righteouſneſs: (though their Ceremonial Law was their Goſpel) So it cannot be ſaid that there is any ſuch bargain concerning Faith in the New Teſtament, but that Chriſt apprehended by Faith is the Righteouſneſs both in the Old, and New Teſtament, which is the thing that we intend, *&c.*

CLVI.

A right underſtanding of the *matter* of our Juſtification, or of what is the *matter* of our Righteouſneſs before God, will help us to underſtand both the *Formal*, and *Inſtrumental cauſe* thereof. The Matter, or Material Cauſe of our Juſtification, *is that which anſwereth to this Queſtion, What is the very thing which cauſeth a man to ſtand righteous before God, and to be accepted to Life everlaſting? We hold that the Satisfaction made by Chriſt in his Death, and Obedience to the Law, is imputed to us, and becomes our Righteouſneſs.* Perkins, *p.* 58. If then Chriſt's Satisfaction or Obedience, be the *matter* of our Righteouſneſs before God, it will thence follow, that the

Formal Cauſe of our Juſtification muſt needs be the Imputation of that Righteouſneſs: for by means thereof it is that we are juſtifi'd from guilt, and accepted to life as effectually as if we were *formaly juſt*, by a perfect Righteouſneſs inherent in us: that imputation with reference to the fruits, and effects thereof, is as it were a *formal inherent Righteouſneſs*: *i.e.* as beneficial to us as if it were ſuch. Hence alſo may the *Inſtrumental* cauſe of Juſtification be gathered, and found out; *viz. Faith*. Becauſe that is the true Inſtrument of Juſtification, by means of which, or by, and upon which, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt becomes imputed to us, and that is *Faith* alone. Faith is all in all for matter of receiving the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; for that Grace which receiveth Chriſt, is that Grace which we call *Faith*: And when the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is once received, the ſinner is Juſtified, there is no more go's to the juſtifying of him. As there go'es no more to the ſealing, or ſtamping of Wax, than its receiving the Impreſſion of the Seal that is put upon it, when that is done it is Sealed.

CLXI.

Nothing can juſtifie us Inſtrumentally, but what can inſtrumentally procure the acquitting of us from our ſins, or the application of ſuch a Righteouſneſs to us as whereby we may be acquitted from all our ſins. *Works*, as *Works*, cannot do that, but *Faith* can: Therefore not Works, but Faith are the Inſtrument of our Juſtification. This is the great Argument which

St.

St. *Paul* insists upon in his three first Chapters to the *Romans* to make way for the Conclusion which he draws up, *Rom.*3.20. *viz.* that we are justified by Faith, and not by the Deeds of the Law; *viz.* because all are sinners, both *Jews*, and *Gentiles*, and it is not their after-obedience to the Law of God that can satisfie for their former sin, and disobedience: neither can any thing justifie us that cannot acquit us from our by-past sins, or satisfie for them; only Christ's Obedience, and not ours, can do that, and that Obedience of our Saviour is apprehended by Faith alone; I say the Righteousness of Christ is received only by *Faith*, and not by *Works*: because Works, or Gospel obedience, are not the Condition of our Justification, as not preceding, but following it: neither is it by them, but by Faith, that Christ and his Righteousness are received; forasmuch as whatsoever it is that receives, or accepteth of Christ his Righteousness, as offered in the Gospel, that is called *Faith*, and intended by the word *Faith*, &c.

CLXII.

If men mistake themselves in the great point of Justification, they may not, yea cannot justly extenuate their fault by charging St. *Paul's* Discourses, and Arguments about it, with great *obscurity*, and that the strength, and force of them, is at leastwise very much concealed, and latent: Witness what that great man, Mr. *Gattaker* saith, (quoting also a greater man than himself, *viz. Jo. Picus, Count. of Mirandula.*) His words

are theſe: *Nor do I conceive this (Epiſtle to the* Romans) *to have gained precedency* (he means as being placed firſt) *ſo much in regard of the preheminence of the place to which it was written, being at that time the head City of the* Roman *Empire, but pricipally rather in regard of the eminency, and excellency, yea deep profoundity of the Myſteries of the Goſpel, more fully, and largly therein delivered, than in any other of them, I may boldly ſay, what if I ſhould ſay in all the reſt of them were they all put together? Add we may hereunto, that the points herein diſcourſed, and debated, are purſued, and proſecuted with that nervoſity of Argument, and vivacity of Spirit, and the limbs and joints of the whole diſcourſe ſo aptly knit together, and artificially riveted into one another, that that Noble* Italian *Earl, ſo much renowned for his variety of Learning, ſharpneſs of Inſight, and ſoundneſs of Judgment, that he was deemed the Miracle of the Age he lived in, is reported to have ſaid; That all the Humane Writings of Learned Men, and great Scholars, that ever he had ſeen, or read, ſeemed to him in compariſon of this one our Apoſtle's Maſter-piece (as he eſteem'd it)* Tanquam ſcopæ diſſolutæ *(as it is in the Proverb) but as Beſomes without bands.* Gattaker 2.

CLXIII.

If what has been ſaid and proved touching the great Doctrine of Juſtification as I have ſtated it be true, there are many Errors in Mr. *Sherlock's* Book, relatiug to that excellent Doctrine: and if ſuch be the true cauſes of Juſtification

tion as I have aſſigned, the cauſes aſſigned by Mr. *Sherlock* are not the true. I preſume he did not foreſee the many ill Conſequences which would follow upon his denying *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, and myriads of abſurdities, that would inſue thereupon; but the Error it ſelf is nevertheleſs chargeable, as followeth.

CLXIV.

Whereas I have aſſerted, and prov'd, that God is the Principal *efficient* of Juſtification, or that it is God who juſtifieth; Mr. *Sh.* Tenet (I do not ſay he himſelf thinketh ſo) ſaith, that He who is juſtified, juſtificth himſelf. He juſtifieth us, whoſe *Righteouſneſs* juſtifieth us: but according to Mr. *Sh.* our own Righteouſneſs, or ſincere Obedience to the Goſpel juſtifieth us, *Ergo*, we juſtifie our ſelves. Wherefore is God ſaid to juſtifie ſinners, but becauſe he provides and imputes a Righteouſneſs whereby they are juſtified? If then the Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified be of our own providing, and procuring, as it is, if obedience to the Goſpel be that Righteouſneſs, then do we juſtifie our ſelves. As *Adam* in caſe he had ſtood might and would have been ſaid to have preſerv'd himſelf in a happy condition, though God gave him at the firſt the grace and power whereby to do it. So though that power whereby we are enabled to obey the Goſpel do come from God, yet may we be ſaid (as well as he in the other place) by the improvement thereof to juſtifie our ſelves, or to do that whereby we are juſtified.

CLXV.

Yea, in case we were justified by our obedience to the Gospel, in opposition to any imputed Righteousness, then do we not only justifie our selves, but justifie our selves upon higher terms, and in a more noble way than others say that God himself doth justifie sinners; *viz.* by way of *Inherency*, or of *Inherent Righteousness*, which is more honorable to us, and denominates us (strictly speaking) more just, than that Righteousness for which we must be beholden to another.

CLXVI.

Mr. *Sherlock's* Tenet, or his denying of Imputed Righteousness, overthroweth, in the next place, the *Proegoumenal*, or inward moving cause of Justification, *viz.* the free Love, Mercy, Grace, and good will of God, which we say did from within stir him up thereunto. But if Believers have a Righteousness Inherent in themselves that is able to justifie them, and God too in accepting it as such, (as Mr. *Sh.* saith, we are justified by our sincere obedience to the Gospel) then not meer free Grace, ευδοκια, and good will, but the Justice, and Righteousness of God's nature, who did foresee that we would in due time obey the Gospel, did move him from Eternity to *decree*, and in time to *effect* our Justification: For look what did move God to accomplish our Justification in time, did move him to decree it from Eternity.

CLXVII.

CLXVII.

Moreover, Mr. *Sh.* Tenet overthroweth the true *Procatarctick* or external moving cauſe of our Juſtification, or denieth it ſo to be. Now that cauſe ſay we is Chriſt; but Mr. *Sh.* or rather his Tenet, ſaith, that foreſeen good Works, or Obedience to the Goſpel was that cauſe. For look by what we are Juſtified principally, by that it is that God was externally (or from without) moved to juſtifie us. But according to Mr. *Sh.* we are Juſtified by our own Inherent Holineſs principally; *viz.* as by the matter, and form of our Righteouſneſs before God: *Ergr.* The contrary to this ſee in a former Theſis.

CLXVIII.

Again, Mr. *Sherlock's* Tenet overthroweth, and denieth that *Inſtrumental Cauſe* of Juſtification, which we have aſſigned, and proved, *viz.* *Faith*, and Faith alone. For if we are Juſtified by a Righteouſneſs of our own, we need not Faith to lay hold upon that Righteouſneſs: ſurely we are not juſtified by believing in our ſelves, or in our own Righteouſneſs. If we are Juſtified by *Goſpel Obedience* principally, there needs no Faith to Juſtifie us *Inſtrumentally*: But if we ſay by Goſpel Obedience only Inſtrumentally, then he advanceth every Grace, and all ſorts of good Works to as great an intereſt in the Juſtifying of a Sinner, as Faith it ſelf hath, which hath been diſproved.

CLXIX.

Mr. *Sherlock's* Tenet aſſigneth that for the *matter* or *material cauſe* of our Juſtification, which I have clearly proved is not, *viz.* our own Righteouſneſs, or Obedience to the Goſpel. If a Righteouſneſs that is *Imputed* be not the matter of our Righteouſneſs before God, as he ſaith it is not, then our Inherent Righteouſneſs muſt: for we muſt be juſtified by ſome Righteouſneſs or other; and every Righteouſneſs muſt conſiſt of ſomething, and that whereof it conſiſts is called the matter, or material cauſe of it: *i. e.* Goſpel obedience is the very thing which cauſeth a man to ſtand righteous before God, and to be accepted to life everlaſting. Now that it is not ſo (beſides what hath been ſaid already to the contrary) I prove thus; *viz.* To juſtifie a ſinner, is to declare him guiltleſs, and faultleſs, as being really ſo, for that by his Surety he hath ſatisfied for all his Treſpaſſes. But God cannot declare a ſinner guiltleſs, and faultleſs, and one who has ſatisfied the Law, by, and upon the account of his own Inherent, and Imperfect Obedience: For then ſhould the Judgment of God not be according to Truth. Again, Whereas Juſtification doth involve Remiſſion of ſins as a neceſſary effect from that cauſe (for to remit ſin is not to puniſh it eternally, and God cannot puniſh their ſins, whom he hath declared to have ſatisfied his Juſtice by Chriſt, ſo as to exempt them from eternal puniſhment) only that Righteouſneſs can be ſaid to juſtifie us, which

which is ſufficient to procure the Remiſſion of our ſins, or we can be juſtified only by that Righteouſneſs, by, or by means whereof our ſins are pardoned: but our ſins are not pardoned by, or for our Inherent, but Chriſt's Imputed Righteouſneſs. *Ergo.* I might add one Argument more. We are juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of *but one*, *Rom.* 5. But inherent Righteouſneſs, or Goſpel-Obedience is the Righteouſeeſs of *many*, yea, of every one who believeth; I mean their own Righteouſneſs: *Subjective Ergo*, we are not juſtified thereby.

CLXX.

Mr. *Sherlock*'s Opinion deſtroyeth the *Formal Cauſe* of Juſtification, which if the Righteouſneſs, or Satisfaction of Chriſt, be the *material* cauſe of Juſtification (as hath been proved) can be nothing elſe but the *Imputation* of that Righteouſneſs. For as a man is *formally* wiſe by the wiſdom that is inherent in him, ſo are all Believers as graciouſly treated by God in reference unto being accepted to eternal Life, upon account of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt *imputed* to them, as if they were *formally*, and *inherently* Righteous. To ſpeak ſtrictly, no man hath any *Formal* Righteouſneſs in this Life, that is perfect, for what is *formal* is inherent, but the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is as beneficial to Believers to ſave them from Hell, and bring them to Heaven, as if it were *formally* in them, and therefore it is called the *Formal Cauſe* of their Juſtification, as ſupplying

the

the room of such a cause. If by the Righteousness of Christ alone, I am justified, and if the Righteousness of Christ is, and can be made, as it were, *formally* mine (or as good for my purpose) by the *Imputing* of it, then the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness is the *Formal* cause of my Justification; which Mr. *Sh.* denies, and needs he must, sith he denies that there is any such thing as *Imputation of Righteousness*, &c. But that there is hath been proved at large.

CLXXI.

Yea, one of the chief *Final Causes* of God's Justifying a Sinner, will fall to the ground if we are Justified (as Mr. *Sh.* saith we are) by our own inherent Righteousness, or Gospel-Obedience; namely, the glorifying of the Riches, and *Freeness* of the *Grace* of God in the Justification and Salvation of Sinners.

Because to be justified by Works, and by *Grace* are inconsistent according to that Text, *Rom.* 11. 6. *If by Grace, then 'tis no more of works; otherwise Grace is no more Grace.* But if it be of works, then *it is no more works; otherwise work is no more work.*

CLXXII.

That Opinion which overthroweth all, and every the causes of Justification commonly assigned by the whole stream of Orthodox Divines (as Mr. *Sherlock*'s Opinion denying Imputed Righteousness hath been proved to do)

must

muſt needs have a very ſuſpicious and dangerous aſpect, and look like a thing to be hated, *Cane & Angue pejus.* (as they ſay.)

CLXXIII.

If by what has been ſaid to weaken Mr. *Sherlock*'s Opinion againſt *Imputed* Righteouſneſs, and to ſtrengthen our own for it, it appeareth (as I hope it plainly doth) that there is ſuch a thing as *Imputed Righteouſneſs* (that hated name, that great Eye-ſore of ſome Men) then two Corollaries will follow thereupon, *viz.*

CLXXIV.

I ſay, it will follow in the firſt place, that *Juſtification* and *Sanctification* are two diſtinct things; or that Sinners are not juſtified by a Righteouſneſs *infuſed*, or *implanted.*

CLXXV.

Secondly, That it is Time and Labour miſſpent to go about to invalidate, and enervate all thoſe places of Scripture which are commonly brought to prove the Doctrine of Imputed Righteouſneſs, as Mr. *Sh.* hath done. For if there be ſuch a thing, ſurely the places which he would otherwiſe interpret, are as fair for it as any.

CLXXVI.

CLXXVI.

Yet it doth not follow, that becauſe good works, Holineſs, or Goſpel-Obedience, are neither the *Efficient*, *Inſtrumental*, *Material*, or *Formal* Cauſe of our Juſtification, that therefore they are not more, or leſs concerned with, and about the compleat Formal and Actual juſtifying of a ſinner, or application of his juſtification to him, or it with them. Certainly other Graces, and Holy Habits beſides *Faith* are concerned as *cauſæ ſine quibus non* of *Juſtification*. For no man can be juſtified that do's not love God, and fear God, and Obey God, *&c.* becauſe the Juſtifying Faith is alwayes accompanied with theſe things (as Life to the Body is with Breath, and inward motion of the heart and blood, *&c.* though Faith be the only Grace which receiveth that Righteouſneſs of Chriſt by which we are juſtified.) Moreover, in order unto being *formally and Actually pardoned*, thoſe great ſins which we ommit after Converſion, it is neceſſary for us to *Repent*, and to *forgive* others, their Treſpaſſes againſt us, to make ſatisfaction to men for injuries done to them, *&c.* Theſe are Conditions upon which Actual, Formal, compleat Pardon are ſuſpended; yea, and to which it is promiſed. Moreover, whatſoever may be pleaded as a ſufficient ground and motive, upon which a man may be cleared from his ſins, may be ſaid to juſtifie him (ſo works *juſtifie*, *Jam.* 2. 22. and *words*, *Mat.* 12. 37.) as evidences that are produced to manifeſt

manifeſt Innocency, *Gattak.* 80. Miniſters in a remote ſenſe may be ſaid to juſtifie, *Dan.* 12.3. *viz.* As inſtruments to bring others to Faith, and ſo to Juſtification.

But when we ſay that we are not juſtified by good works, or Goſpel-Obedience, we mean, as if they were ſo, and in ſuch ſenſe our Righteouſneſs under the *Covenant of Grace*, as perfect perſonal Obedience ſhould have been under the *Covenant of Works*, and as if upon their account, and for their ſakes, it were that we are delivered from Hell, and accepted to Eternal Life, which I ſay is only for Chriſt's ſake, and upon his account, who hath purchaſed Eternal for us, which as to us is a meer gift.

CLXXVII.

Admit of the Doctrine of Juſtification by *Works* as much as by *Faith*, or as being the ſame thing with *Faith*, and the Doctrine of Juſtification by *Merit* cannot be excluded, but will firſt ſteal in inſenſibly, and afterwards come to be owned. For if we are not juſtified by *Grace* then by *Merit*; and if by Works, then not by *Grace*, *Ergo.* If by works, then by merit, or of *Debt*, which is all one, *Rom.* 4. *To him that worketh is the reward of Debt*; and *Rom.* 11. 8. *If it be of Works, 'tis no more of Grace.*

CLXXVIII.

CLXXVIII.

They do very ill Service to the Church of God in *England*, who at ſuch a time when the Papiſts are conceived to be wreſtling a fall with us for all (and therefore ſhould have leſs granted them than before, and no more than is juſt, and fit) do give to them more than ever was given them by Proteſtants, *viz.* the Doctrine of Juſtification by *Works*, and in effect by *Merits*, &c.

CXXIX.

The Perſons with whom Mr. *Sh.* Symbolizeth in denying Imputed Righteouſneſs, and pleading for Juſtification by our ſincere, though imperfect, Obedience to the Goſpel, are two bad ſorts of Men, as moſt are, *viz.* *Socinians*, and *Papiſts*.

CLXXX.

It were eaſie to reckon up ſeveral other things wherein Mr. *Sh.* *Socinianizeth*, or conſenteth with the *Socinians* as ſuch, *Ex. gr.* 1. *In Deo non eſſe Eſſentialem Juſtitiam punientem neceſſario peccata.* Peltius, p. 12. 2. *Nos non peccaſſe in Adamo.* Pel. p. 45. 3. *Homines non ita corruptos aut impotentes eſſe ad bonum vi lapſus Adæ.* Pelt. 48. 4. *Poſſe aliquos ita a peccatis actualibus abſtinere ut opera legis perfecte præſtent* Pelt. p. 77. 5. *Patres V. Teſtam. non eſſe juſtificatos & ſervatos per eandem viam qua nos nimirum per fidem in Chriſtum, aut per Chriſtum*, &c.

Pel. p.

P. p. 114. 6. *Deus potuit ſatisfieri alio modo quam per Chriſti Obedientiam.* Pelt. p. 141. I ſay, it were eaſie to reckon up ſeveral things of great moment, as to which Mr. *Sh.* conſenteth with *Socinians*, but that which is to our preſent purpoſe is that he Symbolizeth with that dangerous ſort of men in ſeveral points relating to *Juſtification. Ex. gr.* 1. They hold that Chriſt his Righteouſneſs is not ours, or is not imputed to us for our Righteouſneſs before God: *P.* 148. 2. That τὸ *credere*, or Faith it's ſelf (as a Grace or Work) is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs. *P.* p. 151. 3. That Obedience to the Commands is our Juſtification, or that we are Juſtified by works. *P.* p. 156.

N. B. I do not ſay that Mr. *Sh.* hath vented the Second, Third, and Fourth *Socinian* errors above mentioned, (in Latine) in words at length, but the paſſages of a Sermon of his, quoted in my *Prodromus* bring him under vehement ſuſpition of all thoſe three.

CLXXXI.

Mr. *Sh.* by denying the Imputation of Chriſt his Righteouſneſs, doth (though it may be he ſees it not) in effect deny the *Satisfaction of Chriſt*, and in ſo doing ſtrike hands with the dangerous *Socinians*, in one of their moſt dangerous, and Characteriſtical Tenets, and caſt in his Lot amongſt them. For how can any man be the better for the payment, or Satisfaction which is made by another, unleſs it be reckoned

to

to him, or put to his account, or done, and accepted on his behalf? Which is all one with being *Imputed*.

CLXXXII.

The Second ſort of men with whom Mr. *Sh.* Symbolizeth in his Notions about Juſtification, are our good Friends the *Papiſts*, with whom Proteſtants formerly had wont to have the greateſt and moſt frequent conteſts, and no greater about any point than the Doctrine of *Juſtification*.

CLXXXIII.

Whereas the Papiſts ſay, that Juſtification is not by *Imputation*, but by *Infuſion* of Righteouſneſs, Mr. *Sh.* ſaith both.

CLXXXIV.

That we are not Juſtified by imputed Righteouſneſs; yea, that there is no ſuch thing, Mr. *Sh.* hath ſaid over, and over again as plainly as words can expreſs it. Witneſs p. 234. where he ſaith, that *Chriſt Righteouſneſs* was not *an imaginary, imputed Righteouſneſs*, intimating that *Imputed* Righteouſneſs is meerly *Imaginary*; and in p. 242. Mr. *Sh.* ſaith, *that Imputed Righteouſneſs doth plainly contradict the Doctrine of our Saviour, and if the Apoſtles had taught any ſuch thing as that, it would very much have weakned their Credit with me, for this had been to Preach another Goſpel than our Saviour did.* And in p. 273. he ſaith, *The Truth is the Righteouſneſs*

eouſneſs of the Law, and of works in the New Teſtament ſignifies only an external Righteouſneſs, which cannot pleaſe God; and that internal Holineſs, which they call the Righteouſneſs of the Law, is that very Righteouſneſs of Faith which the Goſpel commands, and which God approves, and rewards, and this Imputed Righteouſneſs is no where to be found, as I know of, but in their own fancies. Sh. *p.* 273. Moreover, he laboureth to enervate, by giving a different ſenſe thereof, all thoſe texts both in the Old, and New Teſtament, which are commonly brought to prove Imputed righteouſneſs, *ex gr. Jer.* 23. 6. *Iſa.* 45. 24. *Phil.* 3. 8, 9. *Rom.* 10. 4. p. 271. 1 *Cor.* 1. 20. p. 272. and in *p.* 276. he ſaith, *Thus you ſee that there is no foundation in Scripture for all this talk of a Perſonal Righteouſneſs of Chriſt inherent in him, and imputed to us.*

CLXXXV.

Whereas Mr. *Sh.* laieth great ſtreſs upon this Argument, *viz.* that, *In all the Hiſteries of the Goſpel which give us an account of our Saviour's Sermons, and Parables, wherby he inſtructed the People in all neceſſary Truths, he makes no mention at all of the Imputation of his Righteouſneſs to them, but exacts from them a Righteouſneſs of their own if they would find mercy with God.* Sh. *p.* 239, &c. I ſay, whereas he laieth ſo much ſtreſs upon that Argument, that he intimateth, that *if the Apoſtles, or if an Angel from Heaven had preached, and publiſhed Juſtification by Imputed Righteouſneſs, he would ſcarce have believed it.* p. 242. (an un-

toward expreſſion, ſith there is nothing in it contrary to any part of our Saviour's Doctrine,) forasmuch as he meets not with it in any of Chriſt's Sermons.

CLXXXVI.

The ſtrength of that Argument, *viz.* that becauſe the expreſſion of *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, or *Imputation of Chriſt his Righteouſneſs* do's not occur, in ſo many words, in all, or any of our Saviour's Sermons, or Parables, that there is no truth or reality in it, or that there is no ſuch thing: I ſay the ſtrength thereof is but weakneſs. (though it ſeem to be the firſt-born of Mr. *Sherlock's* ſtrength, as to this matter.)

CLXXXVII.

That the ſtrength of ſuch an Argument as that is but weakneſs, I affirm, Firſt upon this ground, Becauſe there might be ſufficient reaſon for our Saviour to omit the Preaching of ſome great, and conſiderable Truths, as namely becauſe they were known, and believed before. As ſome things that are plain in the light of Nature, the Scripture ſaith little of, and the New Teſtament ſaith little or nothing, of thoſe things which were plainly revealed before in the Old. Now that the Juſtification of a ſinner ſhould be by the Righteouſneſs, Suffering, and Satisfaction of the *Meſſias*, was plainly revealed in the Old Teſtament, *ex gr.* Iſa. 53. 11. *By his knowledg ſhall my Righteous Servant juſtifie many, for he ſhall bear their iniquities.* And *v.* 5. *He was wounded*

wounded for our Tranſgreſſions, the chaſtiſements of our peace were upon him, and by his ſtripes we are healed. v. 6. *All we like ſheep have gone aſtray, and God hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,* &c. Dan. 12. 24. *Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people to finiſh the tranſgreſſions, and to make an end of ſins, to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlaſting Righteouſneſs,* &c. The whole *Ceremonial* Law, or the greateſt part of it (which was a kind of viſible Goſpel) did continually preach this Truth, *viz.* that the delivering of us from puniſhment, and accepting of us to life, and favor with God, was to be upon the account of another, the inocent ſuffering for the nocent, *&c.* What elſe was meant by all the bloudy Sacrifices offered for the ſins of the people, in which God accepted the life of a harmleſs ſpotleſs Lamb, as a ranſom for the life of a ſpotted, guilty ſinner? all theſe things typifying, and pointing out, that *without bloud there could be no Remiſſion of ſins.* Dan. 9. 26. *The Meſſias ſhall be cut off, but not for himſelf.* If then there were a ſufficient Light ſhining in the Old Teſtament, in *Moſes,* and the Prophets, to diſcover that the Juſtification of a Sinner, or his being pardoned and accepted with God; was, and always ſhould be by means of another: and particularly by the ſufferings of another; and that a harmleſs, unſpotted perſon; and that the *Meſſias* was he that ſhould ſuffer for our ſins, *Iſa.* 53. 8. *He was cut off out of the land of the living, for the Tranſgreſſion of my people was he ſtricken.* v. 10. *When thou ſhalt make his ſoul an*

offering for ſin, he ſhall ſee his ſeed, &c. *and the pleaſure of the Lord* (which is the Salvation of Souls) *ſhall proſper in his hands*. v. 12, *He bare the ſins of many, and made interceſſion for tranſgreſſors*, &c. What expreſſions can be plainer than theſe? Theſe things conſidered, our Saviour needed not to inſiſt much upon Juſtification, and Salvation by the righteouſneſs and ſufferings of the Meſſias, ſith ſo much had been ſaid of that by the Prophets of the Old Teſtament. And if it be ſaid that the Diſciples of Chriſt, nevertheleſs were very ignorant of the intended death of Chriſt, witneſs *Peter*, who ſaid, *Maſter, theſe things ſhall not happen to thee*, when Chriſt foretold his death, yet our Saviour might not think fit to enlarge much, and often upon that ſubject, leſt his Diſciples ſhould not be able to bear the thoughts of it, like an indulgent tender Wife, that cannot bear to hear much ſaid of her Husbands dying, before her ſelf. See *John* 16. 12.

CLXXXVIII.

If from a total ſilence concerning Imputed Righteouſneſs in all the four Goſpels we could not have gathered any ſuch thing (becauſe there might be good reaſon for ſaying nothing of it) much leſs can we ſafely conclude there is no ſuch thing meerly from its not being mentioned there in ſo many words, as long as we find other expreſſions, and paſſages in theſe texts; *viz.* in the Hiſtories, Sermons, and Parables of Chriſt, which are *Tantamount*, or which do neceſſari-

ceſſarily imply our being Juſtified by the righteouſneſs, or Obedience, by the Death and Sufferings of another. Do's not our Saviour ſay, *John* 6. 5. *If any man eat of this bread he ſhall live for ever, and the bread which I ſhall give is my fleſh, which I will give for the life of the whole world.* Did not the Voice from Heaven ſay, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed?* intimating that we are made accepted to God by Chriſt, and upon his account. Do's not Chriſt ſay, *This is my bloud of the New Teſtament which is ſhed for the Remiſſion of ſins?* intimating that the pardon of our ſins, upon which a title to eternal life neceſſarily inſueth, (for what then can hinder us?) is upon the account of the bloud of Chriſt, ſhed for us, which is the thing that we chiefly mean by that righteouſneſs of Chriſt which is imputed to Believers; *viz.* his *Obedience to the death of the Croſs*, &c. (which was an act of righteouſneſs in Chriſt for that he had promiſed it, and his ſo doing was in purſuance, and performance of his Promiſe, *&c.*) *I come to do thy will, O God, as it is written of me in the volume of thy book.* It was indeed both the effect of righteouſneſs in Chriſt, and it is the cauſe of righteouſneſs in Believers: for upon that account are they accepted of God righteous to eternal life, and therefore may well be call'd the righteouſneſs of Chriſt. According as ſome excellent Divines expound that text, *John* 16. 10. *He* (ſpeaking of the Spirit,) *ſhall convince the world of righteouſneſs, becauſe I go to the Father, and you ſee me no more*, It makes greatly

for *Imputed Righteouſneſs*. For ſay they, the meaning of theſe words is this, The world ſhall be convinced that Jeſus Chriſt has fulfilled the Juſtice of God to the utmoſt, for that he ſhould maintain his ſtanding in Heaven, and they ſhould ſee him upon earth no more: whereas, if he had left any part of the debt unpaid, or had not fulfilled all righteouſneſs, he ſhould have been ſent back again to the earth whence he came, whereas contrary to that the Scripture ſaith, that as *Chriſt died for our ſins, viz.* to pay our debt, *ſo he roſe again for our Juſtification*; *viz.* to manifeſt he was fully acquitted from all that was imputed to him, and ſhould *appear the ſecond time without ſin*, &c. Were the *Iſraelites* that had been ſtung with fiery Serpents, cured by a meer act of viſion, or looking ſimply conſidered, or were they not cured principally by the virtue that was in the Brazen Serpent? It was the Brazen Serpent that cured them, and not they themſelves? Now Chriſt ſaith plainly, *Joh.* 3. 16. *As Moſes lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderneſs, even ſo muſt the Son of man be lifted up*: (viz. upon the Croſs) *That whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh, but have eternal life.* It was by Chriſt Crucified that Believers were to have eternal life: and if ſo, then the Obedience of Chriſt to the death of the Croſs, was, and is imputed to Believers; elſe how come they to have ſuch benefit thereby? If it were not reckoned that Chriſt ſuffered in their ſtead, to ſatisfie for their ſins, or as their *Surety*, whoſe payment was, and is accepted of God

for

for them, &c. What mean thoſe words of Chriſt, *John* 10.15. *I lay down my life for the ſheep?* if the laying down his life be not imputed, or reckoned to his ſheep, or accepted on their behalf as a Propitiation for their ſins? Do we not read in *Luke* 2. 68, 74. of God's redeeming his people by Chriſt, and *raiſing up a horn of Salvation for them in the houſe of David; As he ſpake by the mouth of his Prophets, which have been ſince the world began: That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might ſerve him without fear.* Now could all this be done without ſatisfying Divine Juſtice for ſins, ſince God did inſiſt upon having ſatisfaction; for *without bloud there is no remiſſion of ſins*: and the High prieſt was inſpir'd when he ſaid, *It was neceſſary that one ſhould die for the people.* Do we not read, *John* 1. 29. that thoſe words applyed to Chriſt, *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the ſins of the world.* How did he do that but by being ſlain for the ſins of the world? Now if his death, and ſlaughter, be not *imputed*, or reckoned to us, we ſhall be never the better for it. So alſo *John* 3. 16. *God ſo loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoſoever believeth on him might have eternal life.* So then Chriſt as given, *viz.* to be crucified, and delivered up to death for us, is the principal cauſe of our eſcaping Hell, or attaining eternal life; to both which Juſtification entitleth us. Now how ſhould our title to deliverance from Hell, and to the enjoyment of eternal life, reſult from thence, if Chriſt dying upon the Croſs were not

imputed, or reckoned by God to us, as if we had made ſatisfaction to his juſtice, ſince Chriſt our Surety hath done it to the full? To conclude with thoſe Sacramental words of our Saviour, *This is my body which was broken for you.* If the breaking of Chriſt's body be not imputed, or reckoned to us as a ſatisfaction made for us, or in our behalf, and ſo accepted of the Father, I ſee not how his body was broken for us, *&c.* Sith then all the forementioned places (and it is like ſeveral others in the Goſpels) do hold forth the ſum, and ſubſtance of what we intend by *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, though not aſſert it Syllabically, or in ſo many words, it can be no juſt exception againſt that Doctrine its being a truth.

CLXXXIX.

Another thing in which Mr. *Sh.* ſymbolizeth with *Papiſts* is, in that he averreth Juſtification to be by *Inherent*, or by our own internal Righteouſneſs, as they do, thereby confounding *Juſtification*, and *Sanctification*, and turning the *Covenant of Grace* into a *Covenant of Works*; or making theſe two Covenants (which are ſpecifically diſtinct,) to differ only *ſecundum magis & minus.* For according to him, we are juſtified by our obedience to the Goſpel; and what is that but the effect of Grace infuſed, or the acting, and putting forth of inherent Grace, or if you pleaſe, our own improvement of that Talent of Grace which God hath beſtowed upon us, and conſequently, as I ſaid before, we may be

be ſaid to juſtifie our ſelves, upon as good reaſon as it is ſaid, *He that hath this hope in him purifieth himſelf*, &c. 1 *John* 3. 3. or as it is ſaid, *Seeing ye have purified your ſelves in obeying the Truth*, 1 Pet. 1.

CXC.

Mr. *Sh.* ſo as he ſtateth the Doctrine of Juſtification, aſſerteth that which doth infer *Merit*. I ſay, he contendeth for that from whence the abhorred Doctrine of Juſtification by our own *Merits* may be inferred; and would certainly follow to be true, if that which he ſaith were true. For he ſticks not to own Juſtification to be by our own Evangelical Works; or that we are juſtified by our ſincere obedience to the Laws of Chriſt *Now to him that worketh is the reward imputed of debt*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 4. Now to be rewarded of *Debt*, and that debt for our Work, is all one as to be rewarded of, or upon *Merit*.

CXCI.

Again, the *Papiſts* do ſay, that the Formal Cauſe of Juſtification is Inherent Righteouſneſs; that is, that by our obedience to the Goſpel of Chriſt we are made, or do become formally juſt, in the ſight of God, and righteous to eternal life. Now Mr. *Sh.* ſaith no leſs in ſubſtance, if not in words. Now whether it be more ſafe to ſay (as all ſound Proteſtants have done) that the imputation of our Saviour's Obedience, and Satisfaction, and Righteouſneſs to Believers

is

is that which juſtifieth them, that is, freeth them from guilt, and wrath; and entitleth them Righteous to Eternal Life, as effectually as if they were formally juſt by a perfect inherent Righteouſneſs of their own; I ſay, whether it be ſafer to ſay ſo, or to ſay (as Papiſts do) that the only Righteouſneſs whereby we can be ſaid to be Righteous before God, and whereby we are freed from Hell, and accepted to Eternal Life, is the Righteouſneſs of *Grace*, and *Holineſs* implanted in us, and of good works, the Fruits and Effects thereof, *&c.* Let all Proteſtants, and impartial Chriſtians judge. How dangerous it is to ſay, as *Bellarmin* doth on *Rom.* 3.24. *Juſtificamur per gratiam*, i.e. *per juſtitiam ab illo donatam & infuſam hæc eſt cauſa formalis Juſtificationis noſtræ.*

CXCII.

It were eaſie to charge Mr. *Sherlock*'s Book with ſeveral other things, wherein it harmoniſeth with our Popiſh Adverſaries in the Doctrine of Juſtification: as namely, in denying Faith to be the *Inſtrumental Cauſe* of Juſtification, &c. but *I* take no pleaſure in making the very worſt of what can be made of his expreſſions, and ſhall therefore ſay no more of that.

CXCIII.

Me-thinks it ſhould put Mr. *Sh.* to the bluſh, and make him ſmite upon his Breaſt, if after all that hath been ſaid, *I* ſhould prove that the great Rabbies of the Popiſh Church, have now, and

and then written much more Orthodoxly, and Proteſtant-like, touching Juſtification than he himſelf hath done. *Bellarmin, De Juſtif.* l. 1. Cap. 2. ſaith thus. *This is briefly to be here obſerved, that Chriſt is not the meritorious cauſe of Juſtification, as if the Father in favour to his ſon did forgive us our ſins; as Kings aſſoil guilty Perſons out of favour to, and at the ſuit of Friends, but becauſe he hath payd an exact price of ranſom, and thereby in rigour of Juſtice made ſatisfaction for the wickedneſs of us all. What could any Proteſtant writer ſay in this point more?* ſaith *Mr.* Calfhill, p. 15.

Hear Bellarmin *again, Lib.* 2, *De Juſtif. cap.* 10. *Dicitur inquit Chriſtus Juſtitia noſtra quoniam ſatisfecit Patri pro nobis, & eam ſatisfactionem ita nobis donat, & communicat, quum nos juſtificat, ut noſtra ſatisfactio, & juſtitia dici poſſit. Nam etſi per juſtitiam nobis inherentem vere juſti nominemur, & ſimus, tamen non per eam ſatisfacimus Deo pro culpis noſtris, & pœna æterna,* &c. *Non eſſet abſurdum ſi quis diceret nobis imputari Chriſti Juſtitiam & merita, cum nobis donentur & applicentur ac ſi nos ipſi Deo ſatisfeciſſemus,* &c.

Gabriel Vaſquez, *Tom.* 2. *in* 1, 2. *Diſput.* 222. *cap.* 1. ſaith thus. *Verba iſta Concilii Tridentini Quanquam nemo poſſit eſſe juſtus, niſi cui merita Paſſionis Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti communicantur, dicit idem ſignificare ac ſi diceret niſi cui merita paſſionis Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti imputantur. Diſput. vero* 203. *affirmat rectè dici poſſe merita Chriſti nobis imputari quum agitur de cauſa meritoria juſtificationis, quoniam imputari nobis Chriſti*

merita

merita idem eſt, quod merita illa nobis applicari, & communicari. Upon which Expreſſions put together, *Le Blanc* doth thus animadvert in his Diſcourſe, *De juſtitia Chriſti fidelibus imputata. Unde patet Scholæ Romanæ Theologos immerito carpere noſtram de Imputatione juſtitiæ Chriſti Doctrinam quandoquidem nihil hac in parte vera ſentimus quod vis veritatis ipſos non cogat agnoſcere.* Theſ. 36. That is, *The Romiſh Divines do unjuſtly carp at our Doctrine concerning the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, ſith there is nothing that we think in this matter, which the force of Truth doth not compel them to acknowledge.*

CXCIV.

Not to give Mr. *Sh.* the odium of quoting *all*, or the greateſt part, of thoſe paſſages which do occur in Popiſh Writers, concerning the *Imputation* of *Chriſt's* Righteouſneſs, and other matters relating to Juſtification, in which divers of them have been more Orthodox than himſelf; I do in the next place aver, that the *Homilies* of the Church of *England* are as plain and poſitive for our Juſtification by the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, as Mr. *Sherlock* is, or can be againſt it, and do in ſome other matters referring to Juſtification, manifeſtly contradict him, or he them.

CXCV.

In the Homilie, or Sermon *of Salvation*, we find ſuch paſſages as follow. *Becauſe all men be ſinners, and Offenders againſt God, therefore can*

no

no man by his own Acts, Works, and Deeds (ſeem they never ſo good) be juſtified, and made righteous before God: but every man of neceſſity is conſtrained to ſeek for another righteouſneſs, or juſtification to be received at God's own hands, &c. Again, *God ſent his only ſon into the World to fulfil the Law for us, and by ſhedding his moſt precious Blood to make a ſacrifice and ſatisfaction*, or (as it may be called) *amends to his Father for our ſins*, &c. Again, *The Grace of God doth not ſhut out the juſtice of God in our juſtification, but only ſhutteth out the juſtice of man, that is, the juſtice of our Works*, &c. Again, *Faith doth not ſhut out Repentance, Hope, Love, and the fear of God to be joyned with Faith in every man that is juſtified, but it ſhutteth them out from the effect of juſtifying.* Yet more plainly in the ſame Homily. *So that Chriſt is now the righteouſneſs of them that do truly believe in him. He for them paid the ranſom by his death. He for them fulfilled the Law in his Life. So that now in him, and by him every true Chriſtian may be called a fulfiller of the Law: foraſmuch as that which their infirmity lacketh, Chriſt's juſtice hath ſupplyed.* Again, in the ſecond *Homily of Salvation*, we meet with ſuch paſſages as follow. *Conſider diligently theſe words without works, by Faith only, freely we receive remiſſion of our ſins; what can be ſpoken more plainly, than to ſay, That freely, without works, by Faith only, we obtain remiſſion of our ſins? This Doctrine (viz.* That Faith only juſtifieth, as the margent ſheweth) *advanceth the true Glory of Chriſt, and beateth down the vain glory of man: This whoſoever deni-*

denieth is not to be accounted for a Chriſtian man, nor for a ſetter forth of Chriſt's Glory, but for an Adverſary to Chriſt, and his Goſpel, and for a ſetter forth of mans vain-glory. Let Mr. Sherlock weigh thoſe words well. Again, *Man cannot make himſelf righteous by his own works, neither in part, nor in the whole, for that were the greateſt arrogancy, and preſumption of man, that Anti-Chriſt could ſet up againſt God, to affirm that a man might by his own works take away and purge his own ſins, and ſo juſtifie himſelf.* Again, *The true underſtanding of this Doctrine; we be juſtified freely by Faith without works, or that we be juſtified by Faith in Chriſt only, is not that this our own act to believe in Chriſt doth juſtifie us, for that were to count our ſelves to be juſtified by ſome act, or virtue that is in our ſelves,* &c. Towards the end of that Homily are theſe words, *So that our Faith in Chriſt (as it were) ſaith unto us thus; It is not I that take away your ſins, but it is Chriſt only I ſend you to for that purpoſe, forſaking therein all your good virtues, words, thoughts, and works, and only putting your truſt in Chriſt.*

Again, in the third Homily of Salvation, are theſe expreſſions. *Neverthleſs becauſe Faith doth directly ſend us to Chriſt for remiſſion of our ſins, and that by Faith given us of God we embrace the promiſe of God's Mercy, and of the remiſſion of our ſins (which thing none other of our virtues, or works properly doth) therefore Scripture uſeth to ſay, that Faith without works doth juſtifie.*

CXCVI.

CXCVI.

He that runs may read the fore ſaid paſſages quoted out of the three Homilies *of Salvation* to be directly oppoſite to ſeveral notions delivered by Mr. *Sh.* in his Book, in reference to the Doctrine of Juſtification. For 1. Whereas Mr. *Sh.* confoundeth juſtifying *Faith* and all other Graces, *Faith* and *Goſpel-Obedience*, *Faith* and *ſincere good works*, and maketh as if they were one, and the ſame thing (witneſs what he ſaith in p. 273. of his Book) the Homilies fore-quoted do manifeſtly diſtinguiſh betwixt *Faith* and other Graces, but more plainly betwixt Faith and good works. Witneſs that paſſage, *Faith doth not ſhut out Hope, Love, Repentance, and the fear of God to be joyned with Faith in every man that is juſtified, but it ſhuts them out from the Office of juſtifying.* Now, if Faith, and all theſe Graces were one, and the ſame Faith ſhould ſhut out it ſelf from the Office of juſtifying, according to them. Divers paſſages fore-quoted do ſhew that the Homilies do frequently oppoſe *Faith* and *works*, *Ex. gr.* this for one. *Conſider diligently theſe words without works by Faith only freely we receive remiſſion of our ſins: what can be ſpoken more plainly, than to ſay, that freely, without works, by Faith only we obtain remiſſion of our ſins?* 2. Whereas Mr. *Sh.* intereſſeth all Evangelick Obedience, internal Holineſs, and ſincere good works, in juſtification, as truly, and as much, as *Faith* it ſelf (as he muſt needs do who makes them the ſame with Faith,

Faith, or to be Faith it ſelf) divers paſſages alledged out of the Homilies in the fore-going Theſis do expreſly deny ond contradict that aſſertion of his; witneſs that terrible paſſage which I would wiſh Mr. *Sh.* to think of, namely, That *Faith only* (that is, without works concurring as to that, for that the Margent ſheweth to be the thing treated of) *juſtifieth advanceth the true glory of Chriſt, and beateth down the vain-glory of man: This whoſoever denieth is not to be accounted for a Chriſtian man, nor for a ſetter forth of Chriſt's glory; but for an adverſary to Chriſt and his Goſpel, and for a ſetter forth of man's vain-glory.* 3. Whereas Mr. *Sh.* makes as if Faith it ſelf, the very τὸ *credere*, the habit, or act of believing (whatſoever he underſtands thereby) were the matter of our Righteouſneſs, or our very Evangelical Righteouſneſs before God, the Homily is plain againſt him in theſe words. *The true underſtanding of this Doctrine we be juſtified freely by Faith without Works, is not that this our act to believe in Chriſt doth juſtifie us, for that were to count our ſelves to be juſtified by ſome act, or virtue in our ſelves.* 4. Whereas Mr. *Sh.* utterly denyeth, and derideth *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, witneſs the paſſages which I have quoted out of his Book in *Theſis* 179. to which I ſhall add one or two more, *viz.* that in p. 276. of Mr. *Sh's.* book, where he concludes thus. *Thus you ſee that there is no foundation in Scripture for all this talk of perſonal Rigteouſneſs of Chriſt inherent in him, and imputed to us* Alſo, *Sh.* p. 273. *Thus you ſee how the Apoſtle oppoſeth the Righteouſneſs*

ouſneſs of the Law to the Righteouſneſs of Faith, not as an inherent, and perſonal to an Imputed Righteouſneſs; but as an external, and Ritual, to an inherent, real, and ſubſtantial Righteouſneſs. This is (ſaith *Mr.* Sh.) *the* πρῶτον ψεῦδος, *the Foundation of all other miſtakes in this matter, that by the righteouſneſs of the Law, and the righteouſneſs of Works, moſt men underſtand an inherent holineſs, the conformity of our hearts, and lives to all moral Precepts, and Rules of good life; and then conclude that if this righteouſneſs will not pleaſe God, nothing but an imputed righteouſneſs can, though I ſhould have rather concluded that nothing can: but the truth is, the righteouſneſs of the Law, and of Works in the New Teſtament ſignifies only an external righteouſneſs, which cannot pleaſe God; and that internal holineſs which they call the righteouſneſs of the Law, is that very righteouſneſs of Faith which the Goſpel commands, and which God approves, and rewards, and this imputed righteouſneſs is no where to be found, that I know of, but in their own fancies.* If this long Paragraph be not quite contrary to what the *Homily* declareth, I am much deceived. The words of the *Homily* are theſe. *Man cannot make himſelf righteous by his own works, neither in part, nor in the whole; for that were the greateſt Arrogancy, and Preſumption of man, that Antichriſt could ſet up againſt God, to affirm that a man might by his own works take away his own ſins, and ſo juſtifie himſelf.* But ſaith Mr. *Sh. If internal holineſs will not pleaſe God* (that is, be accepted by him as that righteouſneſs whereby a ſinner is juſtified in his ſight, for of that he was ſpeaking)

I ſhould have concluded that nothing can. Who can reconcile that paſſage of his to this in the Homily, which follow eth. *Becauſe all men be ſinners, and offenders againſt God, therefore can no man by his own acts, words, and deeds be juſtified, and made righteous before God, but every man is conſtrained to ſeek for another righteouſneſs or juſtification to be received at God's own hand.* & again, *God ſent his only Son into the world to fulfil the Law for us, and by ſhedding his moſt precious blood to make a ſacrifice and ſatisfaction, and (as it may be called) amends to his Father for our ſins,* &c. Which paſſage in the Homily plainly tells us another way how God comes to be pleaſed with ſinners, ſo far forth as to juſtifie them: then upon their inherent righteouſneſs, or internal holineſs (which yet is very neceſſary for other purpoſes) *viz.* upon the account of Chriſt his atonement, and ſatisfaction, which being not theirs ſubjectively, and *inherently* if it be not *imputed* to them, they can have no benefit by it. The Homily ſaith expreſly, that *every man is conſtrained to ſeek another righteouſneſs* (*viz.* than that of his own works and deeds) *to be received at God's own hand.* The Homily tells you that our very *Faith*, or *believing* is far from juſtifying us, or being the matter of our righteouſneſs before God, witneſs theſe words. *So that our Faith in Chriſt* (*as it were*) *ſaith to us thus. It is not I that can take away your ſins, but it is Chriſt only; I ſend you to him for that purpoſe, forſaking therein all your good virtue, thoughts, words, and works, and only putting your truſt in Chriſt,* &c. Again, The third

third *Homily of Salvation* ſaith, *Faith doth directly ſend us to Chriſt for remiſſion of ſins, and that by Faith we imbrace the promiſe of God's mercy (which thing no other of our virtues, or works properly doth) therefore ſcripture uſeth to ſay, that Faith without works doth juſtifie.* which paſſage, foraſmuch as it excludeth other graces, and works, beſides *Faith,* from the juſtifying of a ſinner upon this account; that they do not, like *Faith,* properly imbrace the promiſe of God's mercy, and remiſſion of ſin, plainly implieth, and intimateth, that Faith doth juſtifie only *correlatively* to its object Chriſt, and his righteouſneſs, which can be made ours no otherwiſe than by *imputation,* or gracious accepting of us as if we were perfectly righteous with an inherent formal righteouſneſs of our own, ſith it is not ours internally. Therefore there is ſuch a thing as *imputed righteouſneſs,* and that Faith that lays hold upon it is a grace by it ſelf, diſtinct from other graces, and other good works, and is the only inſtrument on mans part, whereby he is juſtified. All this I ſay is true if the *Homilies* of the *Church of England* may be credited. And now methinks I hear thoſe men who find the *Articles,* and the *Homilies of the Church of England* to ſtand ſo much in their light, crying out concerning thoſe that pen'd them, *Utinam neſciiſſent literas,* (as one concerning himſelf) would to God they had been illiterate men, that had never learn'd to write: and (pretending that the Doctrine of *imputed righteouſneſs,* will deſtroy all good *Ethiks*) making bold to abuſe the *Homilies,* and that text toge-

ther, φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίαι κακαί, 1 *Cor.* 15. 33.

CXCVII.

The *Church of England* is not ſingular in the Doctrine declared in their *Homilies* (the Comment of their Articles) *viz.* that *we are juſtified by the Imputation of the righteouſneſs of Chriſt apprehended by Faith:* for it were eaſie to produce a cloud of Witneſſes conſenting with them in this matter, and plainly affirming the ſame thing in their Writings, *viz. Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, Brentius, Chytræus, Hemingius, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Grynæus, Bullinger, Calvin, Gualter, Danæus, Zanchy, Beza, Peter Martyr, Muſculus, Pareus, Urſinus, Marlorat, Junius, Toſſanus, Sybrandus, Bucanus, Pezelius, Aretius, Chamier,* to omit the eminent Divines of our own Nation, ſuch as *Whittaker, Perkins, Pemble,* &c. who have written to the like purpoſe. But oh how vaſtly doth one Mr. *Sh.* outweigh all theſe? *&c.*

CXCVIII.

Whereas in my *Prodromus* I undertook to produce nine eminent Biſhops, (eight of them of the *Church of England*) all ſetting their faces againſt that notion of Juſtification which Mr. *Sherlock* hath delivered to us, *viz.* that we are not juſtified by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt *imputed* to us, but by our own ſincere obedience to the Goſpel (which, ſaith he, is called the righteouſneſs of Faith) having already produced two of the nine, *viz.* Bp. *Davenant,* and Bp. *Downam*

Dounam, in variety of inſtances; there remains but ſeven, the firſt whereof I ſhall now inſtance in is Bp. *Hall*, whom I find as oppoſite to Mr. *Sherlock* in this matter, as a man can be. His words are as follow. *The Evangelical Juſtice* (ſaith Bp. *Hall*) *is not without the intervention of a Saviour; to which claim is laid in two kinds: either as imputative, or as inherent. The inherent wrought in us, the imputed wrought for us. It is the main care of our lives, and deaths, what ſhall give us peace, and acceptation before the dreadful Tribunal of God: What but righteouſneſs? What righteouſneſs, or whoſe? Ours, or Chriſt's? Ours in the inherent graces wrought in us, in the holy works wrought by us; or Chriſt's in his moſt perfect obedience, and meritorious ſatisfaction wrought for us, and applyed to us? The Tridentine faction is for the former* (and ſo we may ſay is Mr. *Sh.*) *we for the latter. God is as direct on our ſide as his word can make him; every where blazoning the defects of our own righteouſneſs, the imperfections of our beſt graces, the deadly nature of our leaſt ſins, the radical ſinfulneſs of our habitual concupiſcence, the pollution of our beſt works: every where extolling the perfect obedience of our Redeemer, the gracious application of that obedience, the ſweet comfort of that application, the aſſurance and unfailableneſs of that comfort; and laſtly, our happy reſt in that aſſurance. Wo were to us if we were not more juſt in that, than ſanctified in our ſelves. We are ſanctified in part, according to the weakneſs of our receit, we are juſtified throughly according to the perfectneſs of thy acceptation. Were we throughly ſanctified here, we*

ſhould be more than men, were we not throughly juſtified we ſhould be no more than ſinners before thee, while we ſtand before thee as ſinners we can have no peace. Let others truſt in the Chariots, and Horſes of their own ſtrength, we will remember the Name of our God. The work of thy Juſtice (or righteouſneſs) ſhall be our Peace. Thus far that Excellent and acute Biſhop.

CXCIX.

The Learned Biſhop *Prideaux*, ſometimes profeſſor of Divinity at *Oxford*, in his Book called *Faſciculus Controverſiarum* (over and above what may be met with in his other works) giveth ample teſtimony to the Doctrine of Believers their being juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to them, and received by Faith alone. That only Faith on man's part doth juſtifie, he proves by this Argument, for one, *p.* 266. *Per quod ſolummodo imputatur nobis Chriſti Juſtitia*, &c. That by which alone, or by which only, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to us which ſatisfieth God's Law, and for man's lapſe, by that only on our part we are juſtified. But *we are juſtified only by his grace through the redemption which is Chriſt Jeſus, whom God hath ſet forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his Blood to declare his Righteouſneſs*, Rom. 3. 24. Whence Chriſt *is made to us Wiſdom, Righteouſneſs, and Redemption*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. In that Argument he plainly declares his Judgment for our being juſtified by the *Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*, for by that

that he proves we are justified by *Faith* alone on our part, for that alone receiveth, or layeth hold on that Righteousness whereby God justifieth a Sinner, or whereby, *ex parte Dei*, or with respect unto God, a Sinner is justified. Yea, one of his Arguments to prove that we are justified by Faith alone, is this, *viz. That Doctrine* (saith he) *which distinguisheth saving Christianity from Judaism, Turcism, and Heathenism, is to be received by all Christians: But such is the Doctrine* (saith he) *of Justification by Faith alone, because Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believeth*, Rom. 10. 4. But if the Doctrine of *Imputed Righteousness* be over-thrown, the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, (as on Man's part) falls to the ground, as Bp. *Prideaux* intimates, for he builds this upon that, and consequently according to that Learned Prelate, the great thing which should distinguish us from *Jews*, *Turks*, and *Heathens*, is taken away; which assertion of his is a kind of calling them (by craft, as they say) either *Jews*, *Turks*, or *Heathens*, who deny the Doctrine of Christ's *Imputed Righteousness*, for in so doing they must needs deny the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, (*ex parte hominis*) for it is the Righteousness of Christ which Faith layeth hold upon, *&c.* Also in p. 298. having started this Objection. If the Imputed Righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith be that which alone doth justifie us, then should we be as Righteous as Christ himself; his Answer to it is this, *Juxta veritatem*

tem rei æque ſumus juſti ſed non æqualiter, nec eodem modo, cum ille juſtus ſic ſubjective, nos imputative, ille de proprio nos illius la gitate. It follows not (ſaith he) that we are Righteous equally with Chriſt himſelf, becauſe he is righteous *ſubjectively* (or in himſelf) we but *Imputatively* (or by the accounting of his righteouſneſs to us) and accepting his Righteouſneſs for us, and on our behalf.) No more need to be ſaid to prove that that Learned Biſhop (whoſe Authority certainly may go as far as Mr. *Sherlock*'s) was a hearty aſſertor of the now deſpiſed Doctrine of *Imputed Righteouſneſs.*

CC.

Edwinus London (as he writes himſelf) that is *Edwin Sands, then Biſhop of London,* in an Epiſtle of his before *Luther's Commentary on the Galatians* (which I know not whether I ſhould not call his ſolemn Licenſe for that Book) writes thus.

This Book being brought to me to peruſe, and to conſider of, I thought it my part not only to allow of it to the Print, but alſo to commend it to the Reader, as a Treatiſe moſt comfortable to all afflicted Conſciences exerciſed in the School of Chriſt. This Author felt what he ſpake, and had experience of what he wrought, &c. Sathan is the Enemy; The Victory is only by Faith in Chriſt. This moſt neceſſary Doctrine the Author hath moſt ſubſtantially cleared in this his Commentary. Which being written in Latine certain godly learned men have tranſlated

ſtated into our Language to the great benefit of all ſuch as with humbled hearts will read the ſame.

If this moſt Reverend Biſhop had not been a hearty Friend to the Doctrine of *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, he would never have given ſo high a Commendation of *Luther*'s work upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, which doubtleſs is full of that kind of Doctrine; yea, ſurely, had he been of Mr. *Sherlock*'s mind, he would have been ſo far from Licenſing that Book himſelf, with reſpect, and Honour, that by his good will, no body elſe ſhould have Licenſed it, but rather have told the World that it was *idle talk, and meer tittle tattle.*

CCI.

The Excellent Biſhop of *Norwich*, that now is, in his Explication of the 110*th. Pſalm*, p. 440. having in the fore-going page ſpoken of Chriſt his ſuffering for us, *as our Head, and Surety* (for ſo he ſpeaks) ſaith, *The fruit which redounds to us hereby is the Expiation of our ſins, by the imputing of his Righteouſneſs unto us. This is my Blood of the New Teſtament, which was ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſin*, Mat. 26. 28. *And in whom we have redemption through his Blood, the forgiveneſs of ſins*, Eph. 1. 7. *The manner whereby the ſatisfaction of Chriſt becomes profitable to us unto the remiſſion of ſin, and Righteouſneſs is by Imputation*, Rom. 4. 3. 5. 8. 5. 19. *Now, all the World is guilty before God,* ὑπεύθυνος γίνεται, *it lyeth in miſchief, and therefore muſt be juſtified by a forreign Righteouſneſs, and that equal*

to

to the Justice offended, which is the Righteousness of God unto us graciously imputed. As there is a Personal and individual unity whereby a man is one, in, and by himself: So there is a common unity whereby a man is one with another. And this is the ground of righteousness imputed. Unitas [illegible] præstantis est fundamentum proprietatis ad [illegible] præstitum, i. e. Onenes with the performer [illegible] foundation of our propriety to the good Office performed. So then betwixt Christ and us there must be an Unity, or else there can be no Imputation. It is said, that Faith is Imputed for righteousness, Rom. 4. 5. *not the* to credere, *or the Act of Believing as it is a work proceeding from us by grace, but because it is the bond of Union betwixt us, and Christ and by that means makes way to the Imputation of Christs righteousness to us. 'Tis generally consented to by them that have read his Works that Dr.* Reynolds, now Bishop of *Norwich,* useth to write *sense*, and nothing but what is good *sense*, and yet I find all the passages fore-mentioned in that book of his, which I mentioned before, nor do I know how much time it would take up to transcribe all that that Excellent Person has said concerning *Imputed righteousness*, in his several most worthy Writings. These that I have quoted are enough to shew that he, and Mr. *Sh.* are not of a judgment about that grand affair.

CCII.

Bishop *Andrews,* who is universally owned to have been an excellent Scholar, and an able Divine, in his Sermon of *Justification* (towards the

the end of his Book of Sermons) writes thus. *In the Scripture* (ſaith he) *there is a double righteouſneſs ſet down both in the Old, and in the New Teſtament. in the Old Teſtament, and in the very firſt place that righteouſneſs is mentioned in the Bible,* Gen. 18. 10. *Abraham* believed and it was counted to him for righteouſneſs. *And again in the very next line it is mentioned, Abraham* will teach his houſe to do righteouſneſs. *A righteouſneſs done. In the New likewiſe, the former, in one chapter (even the fourth to the* Romans) *no fewer than eleven times* Reputatum eſt illi ad Juſtitiam. *A reputed righteouſneſs. The latter in* St. John 1. 3, 7. He that doth righteouſneſs is righteous. *A righteouſneſs done. The one is a quality of the party, the other an act of the Judge declaring, or pronouncing righteous. The one ours by influence, or infuſion, the other by accompt, or imputation: when Chriſt is called Jehovah, our righteouſneſs, that great Biſhop expoundeth it of righteouſneſs imputed: For* (ſaith he p. 76.) *The tenour of the Scripture touching our Juſtification all along runs in judicial terms. When we ſhall once be brought and arraigned before the righteous judge ſitting upon the throne* (which he ſpeaks alluding to *Prov.* 20. 8.) *we ſhall there ſee that righteouſneſs in that ſenſe* (whereby he meaneth inherent righteouſneſs) *will not abide the trial. Bring them hither then* (meaning to God's Tribunal) *and aſk them here of this name, and never a Saint, nor Father, no not the Schoolmen themſelves, but will ſhew how to underſtand it aright. In their Commentaries it may be in their Queſtions, and Debates they will hold hard*

the other: but remove them hither, they forſake it preſently, and take the name in the right ſenſe. Juſt and perfect Job *ſtanding here. Though I be juſt (ſaith he) I will not hold up my head (i. e. I will never plead it, or ſtand upon, but put up a ſupplication to be relieved by Jehovah,* Juſtitia noſtra. David *dareth not ſtand here, but deſireth God not to enter into judgment with him,* &c. *But if we muſt come (viz. to the judgment of God, as thither we muſt come all) then he will never account his own righteouſneſs, but make mention of this name,* Jehovah juſtitia noſtra. Daniel, *that man ſo greatly beloved, after he ſaw the Antient of days ſet down on his Throne, and the book open before him there: Not in our righteouſneſs,* Dan. 9. 18. *Yet was that righteouſneſs* a Jehovah, *(from the Lord) but here it would not ſerve, he muſt wait for the Meſſias, and the everlaſting righteouſneſs which he bringeth with him.* Eſay, *at the Viſion of God ſitting upon his Throne, crieth out, Woe is me, I am a man of polluted lips: Woe is me, for I have held my peace. There he ſeeth that the very ſins of omiſſion, and the very ſins of his lips would be enough to condemn him, though he had never in act committed any.* St. Paul *ſaith, Though I know nothing by my ſelf, and ſo had Juſtification* a Domino, *I am not therefore juſtified: It is another righteouſneſs, and not that, muſt acquit him. Yea, the very Schoolmen themſelves (ſaith he) take them from their Queſtions, Quodlibets,* &c. *let them be in the Soliloquies, Meditations, or Devotions, and ſpecially in directing how to deal with men in their laſt agony, when the Judge ſtands before the door, then take* Anſelm, *take* Boneven-

neventure, *take* Gerſon, *you would not wiſh to find* Jehovah our Righteouſneſs *better, or more pregnantly acknowledged, than in them you ſhall find it. And indeed, ſaith he, ſo far as concerneth ſatisfaction for ſin, and our eſcaping from eternal death, the Church of* Rome *taketh this name aright, and now they find no ſuch abſurdity in it, that Chriſt his righteouſneſs, and merit, are imputed to us: but in the poſitive Juſtice, or that part thereof which is meritorious for reward, there fall they into a phanſie that a righteouſneſs inherent in themſelves, without the righteouſneſs that is in Chriſt, will ſerve them. The reaſon, ſaith* Bellarmin, *why in ſatisfaction for ſin we need Criſt's righteouſneſs to be accounted ours is becauſe the offence is infinite. We reaſon* a pari. *There muſt alſo be an infinite merit, becauſe the reward is no leſs infinite. Is there not as much required to purchaſe for us the Crown of Glory, as to redeem us from the torments of Hell?* Bellarmin, *after his long Diſputation, taking upon him to anſwer a caſe of Conſcience, whether a man might repoſe any truſt in that which he had ſo long argued for, ſaith at laſt, that* Propter incertitudinem propriæ Juſtitiæ, & periculum inanis gloriæ, tutiſſimum eſt fiduciam totam in ſola Dei miſericordia reponere. *That is, Conſidering the uncertainty of man's righteouſneſs, and the dangerouſneſs of vain-glory, it is moſt ſafe to repoſe all our confidence in the mercy of God alone.* Thus far Bp. *Andrews*, beſides ſeveral other paſſages which might be gathered out of his Sermon of *Juſtification*, on *Jer.* 23. 6. which he tranſlates thus; *This is the name whereby they ſhall call him, The Lord our Righteouſneſs.* Plainly declaring

claring his ſtedfaſt Judgment to have been for the Doctrine of *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, and for the inſufficiency of any *Righteouſneſs Inherent*, as for the purpoſe of *Juſtification*. How much were it to be wiſht that Mr. *Sh.* were but as Orthodox in that point, and that he had taken in his firſt ſeaſoning from ſuch ſound Authors as was that renowned *Biſhop*, rather than from *Socinus*, or any of his Complices.

CCIII.

The late Reverend Biſhop of *Glouceſter* in his *Expoſition of the Catechiſm of the Church of* England, p. 71. hath theſe words. *But yet full ſatisfaction he may plead* (ſpeaking of a Believer) *The Obedience of the Son of God both Active and Paſſive*; Active, *in keeping and fulfilling every tittle of the Law*; *and* Paſſive, *in ſuffering the wrath of God due for the breach of the Law: Out of which Obedience ariſeth that actual juſtice in Chriſt, that being imputed to us, in reſpect of that Relation in which we ſtand unto Chriſt* (*he and all his Elect being taken for one Body*) *God doth releaſe, acquit, and diſcharge the guilty ſinner.* And p. 73. *God imputing to all penitent, and believing ſinners the Obedience of his own Son, and his righteouſneſs accounts them juſt in his ſight.* No man that reads thoſe paſſages can doubt that Learned Prelate (for ſo his works ſpeak him) to have been poſitive and peremptory for the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to Believers, and their Juſtification thereby, which he lays down as a Catechiſtical, Fundamental Truth, for writing

writing an Expoſition upon the Church Catechiſm, his whole buſineſs lyes with ſuch Truths as thoſe; Therefore in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to the preſent Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, he hath theſe words. *I thought it my Duty to invoke your Lordſhips Patronage. and that you would be my Buckler as you haven been hitherto, againſt any that ſhould dare to oppoſe theſe ſolid, and fundamental Truths, which none will be ſo impudent to contradict, but branded Hereticks, and hot-brain'd Fanaticks* I ſuppoſe Mr. *Sh.* do's not take himſelf to be either of thoſe two; but you ſee what that Learned Prelate ſaith of all them who contradict the Truths aſſerted in his Expoſition of the Catechiſm, which he calls *fundamental*, (and I am ſure Juſtification is one of the greateſt points that can be handled in any Catechiſm; therefore the Truths that concern that muſt be great *Fundamentals*) *I* ſay, you ſee what he ſaith of ſuch Perſons, in *Theſi* and it is no hard thing to reduce it *ad Hypotheſin.*

CCIV.

Biſhop Abbot, in his Defence of Mr. *Perkins* his book, called *The Reformed Catholick*, againſt Dr. *Biſhop*, doth highly aſſert and vindicate the Doctrine of Juſtification by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *Imputed*, witneſs the following paſſages. 1. In p. 381. *That our Juſtification and Righteouſneſs before God ſtandeth not in any inward virtues, or graces powred into our Souls, but in the Imputation of Chriſt's Obedience, and Righteouſneſs made ours by Faith ſhall be proved unto him,*

God

God willing, by better Arguments than he ſhall be able to diſprove. 2. In p. 382. he ſaith,

It is truly ſaid by Mr *Perkins*, that *the Church of* Rome *in teaching juſtification by Works doth raze the very Foundation of Chriſtian Faith, and maketh Chriſt but a counterfeit and falſe Chriſt; becauſe, as ſaith the Apoſtle, If Righteouſneſs be by the Law, then Chriſt dyed in vain*, Gal. 2. 21. *Therefore peremptorily he denounceth, Ye are aboliſhed from Chriſt, ye are fallen from Grace whoſoever are juſtified by the Law*, Gal. 5. 4. 3. In p. 384. *In whom* (ſpeaking of Chriſt) *and not in our ſelves, we are made the Righteouſneſs of God; that is, juſt in the ſight of God, in that his Obedience, and Righteouſneſs performed and wrought in our Name, and for our behoof, is imputed unto us, by Faith in his Blood.* 4 In p. 388. *Bp.* Abbot *vindicates Mr.* Perkins his firſt reaſon for imputed Righteouſneſs, *viz. That which muſt be our Righteouſneſs before God muſt ſatisfie the Juſtice of the Law, which ſaith, Do theſe things and thou ſhalt live. But there is nothing that can ſatisfie that juſtice of the Law but the Righteouſneſs, and Obedience of Chriſt. Ergo.* 5. In p 400. he vindicates Mr. *Perkins* his ſecond reaſon for imputed Righteouſneſs, *viz.* That, *As Chriſt was made ſin for us, ſo we are made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*, 2 Cor. 5. 21. *But Chriſt was made ſin by the Imputation of our ſins, he being moſt Holy: Therefore a ſinner is made Righteous in that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is Imputed to him.* 6. In p. 404. the excellent *Bp.* afore-ſaid vindicates Mr. *Perkins* his third

Reaſon

Reaſon for imputed Righteouſneſs, *viz.* from *Rom.* 5. *As by one mans diſobedience*, &c. whence he argues thus. *As by the diſobedience of* Adam *men were made ſinners, ſo by the Obedience of Chriſt they are made righteous: But men are made Sinners by Imputation of* Adam's *ſin unto them*, Ergo. *By Imputation of Chriſt's Juſtice we are made righteous.* 7. In p. 413. he vindicateth Mr. *Perkins* his fourth and laſt Reaſon for imputed Righteouſneſs, taken from the conſent of the Ancient Church, *&c.* 8. In p. 422. *Bp. Abbot* takes upon him to defend the Anſwers which Mr. *Perkins* gave to all and every the Objections which the Papiſts bring againſt *Imputed* righteouſneſs, and the Arguments for Juſtification by a Righteouſneſs *Inherent.* Thus you ſee that Mr. *Perkins* himſelf was not a greater aſſerter of the imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to believers, and their Juſtification thereby, than was the Learned and Excellent *Biſhop Abbot*, whoſe Judgment, and Authority will weigh in the balance, againſt twenty ſuch young Gentlemen, with their ſhels upon their heads, as he that hath taken upon him to oppoſe and deride it.

CCV.

Bp. Morton, in his book called, *The Proteſtants Appeal*, p. 69. plainly declareth himſelf for *Imputed righteouſneſs*, by his quoting for the confirmation of it the following paſſage out of *venerable Bede. Nothing can be more for our Juſtification by the* imputed *merits of our head Chriſt*

than that his Heavenly axiome, ſaying, the condemnation of Chriſt is our juſtification. Nothing more oppoſite unto the Romiſh *juſtifying by Inherent perfection than* (ſpeaking of the regenerate) *to ſay, no man ſhall be ſaved by the righteouſneſs of Works, but by the only righteouſneſs of Faith.* Now, that by Faith there he would have us to underſtand the Object of Faith, *viz.* the righteouſneſs of Chriſt which Faith takes hold of, and relatively to which Faith is ſaid to juſtifie, may be gathered from a ſimilitude which he uſeth, in p. 630. *Yet underſtand, good Reader* (ſaith he) *that of as a ring of Gold wherein there is incloſed a precious Stone of ſome ſingular virtue to cure thy Diſeaſe, thou uſeſt to ſay that the ring doth cure thy grief, yet not of it's own virtue, although it be of Gold, but by the power of the precious Stone, which it contains; ſo ſay we, that Faith juſtifieth, but not by any merit, or worthineſs in it ſelf, although it be the gift of God, and a virtue Theological, but by the power and virtue of Chriſt his precious merit of redemption, the object which it claſpeth, and apprehendeth.*

CCVI.

The incomparable Primate of *Armagh*, Bp. *Uſher*, in his *Body of Divinity*, p. 193. and in ſeveral other parts thereof, declareth himſelf abundantly for the Doctrine of Juſtification by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *Imputed*.

Juſtification, ſaith he, *is the Sentence of God, whereby he of his Grace for the righteouſneſs of his Son, by him imputed to us, and through Faith apprehended by us, doth free us from ſin and Death, and*

and account us righteous unto Life. For hereby we both have a deliverance from the Guilt, and punishment of all our ſins, and being accounted righteous in the ſight of God by the righteouſneſs of our Saviour Chriſt imputed to us, are reſtored to a better Righteouſneſs than ever we had in Adam. p. 194. *Thus God imputing the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to a ſinner doth not account his ſins to him, but intereſts him in a ſtate of as full, and perfect freedom, and acceptance, as if he had never ſinned, or had himſelf fully ſatisfied. The matter of Juſtification, or that righteouſneſs whereby a ſinner ſtands juſtified in God's ſight, is not any righteouſneſs inherent in his own Perſon, and performed by him, but a perfect righteouſneſs inherent in Chriſt, and performed for him. The Form, or being Cauſe of our juſtification, and that which makes the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt ſo really ours that it doth juſtifie us is the gracious Imputation of God the Father accounting his Son's righteouſneſs unto the ſinner, and by that allowing, making it his to all effects, as if he himſelf had performed it.* Thus far Bp. *Uſher.* Then he puts the Queſtion. *But how can Chriſt's righteouſneſs be accounted ours? Is it not as abſurd to ſay that we are juſtified by Chriſt's righteouſneſs, as that a man ſhould be wiſe with the wiſdom of another?* &c. *Anſwereth it thus; no doubtleſs, becauſe this righteouſneſs is in Chriſt, not as in a perſon ſevered from us, but as in the Head of the Church, the ſecond* Adam, *from whom therefore it is communicated to all, who being united as Members to him do lay claim thereunto, and apply it unto themſelves,* Rom. 5. 19. Rom. 10. 4. *For if*

the ſin of Adam *were of force to condemn us all, becauſe we were in his Loins, he being the head of our common Nature; why then ſhould it ſeem ſtrange that the Righteouſneſs of our Saviour Chriſt, both God, and Man, ſhould be available to juſtifie thoſe that are intereſſed in him, eſpecially conſidering we have a more ſtrict conjunction in the Spirit with him, than ever we had in Nature with* Adam? *And though it be not fit to meaſure Heavenly things by the Yard of reaſon, yet it is not unreaſonable that a man owing a thouſand pounds, and not being able to pay it, his Creditor may be ſatisfied by one of his Friends.* In p. 196. that Excellent Prelate hath this paſſage. *So that Faith juſtifieth only relatively, in reſpect of the Object which it faſtneth on; to wit, the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, by which we are juſtified: Faith being only the Inſtrument to convey ſo great a benefit unto the Soul, as the hand of the Beggar receives the Almes.*

CCVII.

The oppoſers of Chriſt's *Imputed righteouſneſs*, and of Juſtification by Faith alone, on Man's part, are found Fighters not only againſt the Writings of the Generality of the moſt eminent Divines of the Reformed Churches (as I have inſtanced in above thirty) but alſo againſt many Renowned Biſhops of the Church of *England*, whoſe Names and ſayings have been mentioned; and not againſt them only, but alſo againſt the *Homilies*, as hath been made appear by ſeveral paſſages alledged from thence, which are point blank againſt them; yea, over and

and above all that, they will appear to fight againſt the *eleventh Article of the Church of* England, ſtiled; *Of the juſtification of man.* For that *Article* runs thus; *We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, by Faith, and not for our own Works, or deſervings. Wherefore that we are juſtified by Faith only is moſt wholſom Doctrine, and full of comfort.* Thoſe are the very words of the Article. By the *merits* of Chriſt doubtleſs are meant his Active, and Paſſive Obedience, or what he did and ſuffered for Believers, in order to meriting and purchaſing Eternal Life for them, which Obedience of our Saviour we call his *righteouſneſs.* Now, ſaith the Article, we are accounted Righteous before God (that is, we are juſtified) *only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.* But, ſaith Mr. *Sh.* (and as many as are of his mind) we are accounted Righteous before God for our ſincere Obedience to the Goſpel, or for our internal Holineſs. For, ſaith he, *p.* 273. having ſpoken juſt before *of Internal Holineſs, and the conformity of our hearts and Lives to all moral Precepts. If this righteouſneſs will not pleaſe God, I ſhould have concluded that nothing can.* He goes on, and ſaith, *That Internal Holineſs, which they call the righteouſneſs of the Law, is that very righteouſneſs of Faith which the Goſpel commands, and which God approves and rewards; and this Imputed righteouſneſs is no where to be found but in their own fancies.* From thoſe words of his I Argue thus againſt him. A man is counted Righteous

before God (or juſtified, which is the ſame thing) for that which is his Righteouſneſs, eſpecially his only Righteouſneſs in the ſight of God. But according to Mr. *Sh.* our only Evangelical Righteouſneſs in the ſight of God is our internal Holineſs, and conformity of our hearts and lives to all moral Principles, and Rules of a good life. *Ergo.* By our internal Holineſs we are counted righteous (ſavingly) or juſtified in the ſight of God. Imputed Righteouſneſs being no where to be found that Mr. *Sh.* knows of, but in mens own fancies, men muſt neceſſarily be juſtified by inherent Righteouſneſs, according to Mr. *Sh.* or without any righteouſneſs at all. The latter cannot be, that a man ſhould be righteous without any righteouſneſs; therefore he is ſo in the ſight of God, and to ſalvation (for that we are ſpeaking of) by, and for his inherent holineſs, or Goſpel obedience. And if ſo, Then Believers are not accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of Jeſus Chriſt (as the Article ſaith) yea ſo far from that, that they are not counted righteous before God, ſo much as partly, or in part, for the merit of Chriſt; becauſe their only righteouſneſs (according to Mr. *Sh.*) is their internal holineſs, and conformity to moral Precepts. Again, if we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of Jeſus Chriſt, as the Article ſaith, then we are ſo accounted by, and for, an *imputed righteouſneſs*; yea by, and for an *imputed righteouſneſs* only. For there are but two ways whereby any righteouſneſs can be ours:

ours: *viz.* either by *Inherency*, or by *Imputation*. But the merits of Jeſus Chriſt are not *inherent* in us; therefore if they be our righteouſneſs in the ſight of God, they muſt be *imputed* to us. Nothing can be more plain than that, if we are juſtified by the righteouſneſs of another, *viz.* of Chriſt, we are juſtified by a righteouſneſs *imputed*, and not *inherent*; and conſequently that there is ſuch a thing as *imputed righteouſneſs*, elſewhere than in the fancies of men. Sure I am, The merits of Chriſt can avail us nothing, unleſs they be imputed, or reckoned to us; or unleſs God, upon the account thereof (and not of our own internal holineſs) do deal with us, as if we in, and of our ſelves had been worthy of eternal life, Chriſt's meriting had ſignified nothing to us, unleſs he had merited for us, or with an intention that his merits ſhould be put to our account; as Chriſt's giving up himſelf to death, had been of no uſe to us, unleſs he had loved us, and given himſelf for us. If Chriſt's merit be not imputed to us, for the accepting of us righteous before God, we have no advantage by it any more than a man can have had by a plaiſter that was never applyed. Now they that ſay we are juſtified only for the merit of Chriſt (or for the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed, which hath been prov'd to come all to one,) as ſaith the *Article* of our Church, do vaſtly differ from Mr. *Sh.* that ſaith we are not juſtified, no not partly, by *Imputed Righteouſneſs*; yea indeed, that there is no ſuch thing. If his evaſion ſhould be that Chriſt hath merited that our ſincere obe-

dience, and God's acceptance thereof, inſtead of that which is compleat and perfect, ſhould be the *matter*, and *form* of our juſtification, or righteouſneſs before God (which is like the Papiſts notion, *viz.* that works dyed in the blood of Chriſt do juſtifie) I ſay, ſuch a notion as that is very unſound and unſafe. For that were to make as if Chriſt did give away the glory of Juſtification, and Salvation to another, *viz.* to our *Goſpel obedience*; and died not to ſave us himſelf, but make us Saviours to our ſelves: or had ſaid to *Faith*, and *Good Works*, as *Joab* did to *David*, 2 Sam. 12. 27. *I have fought againſt Rabbah, and have taken the City of Waters. Now therefore encamp thou againſt the City and take it, leſt I take the City, and it be called after my name.* i. e. he had as good as done the work, but he would have *David* have the honor of it. To ſay that Chriſt merited that we might merit; (or be counted worthy of eternal life upon account of our own inherent righteouſneſs, which is all one) is to ſay that Chriſt who merited that we ſhould be ſaved by his *Grace*, merited that we ſhould be ſaved by our own works, which is a contradiction to reaſon, and a turning the Covenant of Grace into a Covenant of Works. To ſay that Chriſt hath merited that our ſincere, though imperfect obedience to the Goſpel ſhould be the righteouſneſs whereby we are counted ſavingly righteous before God; is, 1. To attribute the Pa ion of our ſins to our own good works, (for by what we are juſtified, by that we are pardoned; or by that righteouſneſs our ſins are covered)

vered) now that cannot be, for our leſs than due obedience cannot ſatisfie God for our diſobedience. Or, 2. It were to make as if the imputing, or imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs to Believers, would not have been ſufficient for their Juſtification, unleſs that imputed Righteouſneſs were eaked out for that purpoſe by our good works, as our good works had not been ſufficient if they had not been eaked out with the righteouſneſs of Chriſt. Now who dares to think that for God to have reckoned what Chriſt had done and ſuffered, as Mediator, to have been done and ſuffered for us, and in our behalf, had not been ſufficient to have freed us from hell, and entitled us to eternal life? And if that alone be ſufficient, why ſhould we think that God hath added *Goſpel Obedience* as a Partner with Chriſt in the juſtification of a ſinner; or that we are juſtified partly by Chriſt's paſſive, and partly by our own active obedience? They that ſhall venture between thoſe two ſtools will fall to the ground. Far be it from us to think that Chriſt hath died to make a Saviour of any thing, or of any body but himſelf. If God need do no more than reckon to us the ſatisfaction made to his Law, and Juſtice, by Chriſt our *Surety*, as if we had made it our ſelves, in order to his making us happy (with conſiſtence to all his Attributes) why ſhould we think that God doth call in the aſſiſtance of *Inherent Righteouſneſs*, for, and towards the juſtifying of a ſinner? *Fruſtra fit per plura.* He that ſaith, *If there had been a Law that could have given Righteouſneſs, verily*

verily Righteouſneſs ſhould have been by that Law. Would he not ſay that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed being alone ſufficient for the Juſtification of a ſinner, verily he ſhall be juſtified by that righteouſneſs alone. *Internal* Righteouſneſs is good for many other excellent purpoſes, though not to be the matter of our Juſtifying righteouſneſs before God; as Gold and Silver are good for many things, though not to eat. Upon the whole matter I find Mr. *Sh.* (and as many more as are of his mind) highly peccant againſt the 11*th Article* of our Church, as to the firſt Propoſition therein contained; *viz.* that *only for the merit of our Lord, and Saviour Chriſt, we are accepted righteous before God.* Concerning which Mr. *Rogers* (*the then Arch Biſhops Chaplain,* and explainer of the Articles by Allowance) addeth, *And this is the Faith, and Confeſſion of all the Churches Reformed.* The 2*d* Propoſition contained in the 11*th* Article, according to Mr. *Rogers* his diviſion of it, is this, *Only by Faith are we accounted righteous before God.* This branch of the Article ſeems to hold forth how, and by what means we become intereſſed in the merit of Chriſt, for which alone we are counted righteous before God, *viz.* by *Faith.* But Mr. *Sh.* contradicteth that firſt Aſſertion two ways: 1. By ſaying in effect that we are juſtified as truly, and as much, by *Repentance*, *Love*, and every other Grace, as by *Faith.* For he makes *Faith* to be the Sum, and Subſtance of all Graces, as if every grace were *Faith*, and *Faith* were all graces in one. 2. By ſaying that we are juſtified,

juſtified or accounted righteous before God not only by *Faith*, but alſo by *Good Works*, which he calls *Faith*, or the *Righteouſneſs of Faith*, witneſs, *Sh.* p. 273. where he ſaith, *That internal Holineſs*, which they call the Righteouſneſs of the Law, is that very righteouſneſs of *Faith* which the Goſpel commands. Now that Internal Holineſs, *he calls a conformity of heart and life to the Moral Precepts*, which making to be the ſame thing with *Faith*, he ſtrangly confounds *Faith* and *Good Works*, and makes them both one. In ſo doing he contradicteth the third Propoſition contained in the Article which I am ſpeaking of; *viz.* that *we are counted righteous before God not for our own works, or deſervings.* In which words there is a manifeſt oppoſition made betwixt *Faith*, and *Good Works*, which Mr. *Sh* would have us take for one and the ſame thing. He makes as if *Faith*, and *Good Works* are all one, and ſo brings in Works into Juſtification; whereas the Article not only diſtinguiſheth, but oppoſeth them, and ſo excludes *Works* from Juſtification. He that with reference to what hath been objected, can reconcile Mr. *Sh*'s. Tenets of Juſtification to the 11*th Article* of our Church, *erit mihi Magnus Apollo.* Now that the World may be ſure that I have not miſtaken the ſenſe and meaning of the Church in this their 11*th Article*, I appeal to the *Homilies* before cited; and who knows not that the Homilies are the moſt genuine, and authentick Comment upon the Articles? (as the Prophets of the Old Teſtament were upon the

five

five Books of *Moſes.*) and doubtleſs as the *Homilies* have ſtated the Doctrine of Juſtification; ſo the Article intended it. And therefore whoſoever contradicts the *Homilies* in the point of Juſtification (as Mr. *Sh.* has done abundantly) muſt contradict the *Articles* alſo. After all this, I can hardly forbear to put forth ſuch a Queſtion to Mr. *Sh.* as *Dalilah* did to *Sampſon*, *Now tell me, I pray thee, wherewith thou mighteſt be bound?* Judg. 15. 10. If neither the general current of Orthodox, and Famous Divines of the Reformed Churches; nor the unanimous conſent of many renowned Biſhops of the Church of *England*; nor the *Homilies*; nor the *Articles* of our Church; nor all together, can hold you; *tell me, I pray thee, wherewith thou mayſt be bound, and wherein thy great ſtrength lieth.*

CCVIII.

Conſidering how great, and manifold an intereſt the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which can be ours only by *Imputation*, has been proved to have in the buſineſs of juſtifying a ſinner before God, their *error*, *ſin*, and *preſumption* muſt needs be great, who ſet themſelves to oppoſe that righteouſneſs, and the imputation of it. For it hath been proved that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, is the *material cauſe* of our Juſtification, or the *matter* of our Righteouſneſs before God; or that Righteouſneſs by which, and with which, and upon the account of which believers are juſtified in God's ſight. Alſo, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the *Meritorious cauſe* of our Juſtification, or that Righteouſneſs for which, or for the

ſake

ſake of which, and by the merit and deſert of which, Believers have their ſins pardoned, and are accepted righteous to eternal life. It hath alſo been proved that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is the *Formal cauſe* of Juſtification, if conſidered as *imputed*, or that the *imputation* of Chriſt his Righteouſneſs is ſo; not that Believers are *formally* righteous with the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as a wiſe man is formally wiſe by his inherent wiſdome; but for that they are as effectually ſaved from Hell, and accepted to eternal life upon account of what Chriſt hath done, and ſuffered for them, (which I call his Righteouſneſs) as if they had a perfect compleat Righteouſneſs inherent in themſelves (whereby they were formally righteous in the ſtricteſt ſenſe) with which to appear before God. I have alſo proved the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to be the great *Object* of that Faith which has been ſaid to be the *Inſtrumental* cauſe of Juſtification, and that Faith is ſaid to juſtifie us only *correlatively* unto Chriſt Crucified, Chriſt fulfilling all righteouſneſs for us, whoſe righteouſneſs is apprehended, accepted, and applyed by Faith alone. That the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is alſo the *Procatarctical* cauſe of our Juſtification, or the great cauſe which doth move God, *ab extra* (or from without himſelf) in oppoſition to the *proegumenal*, or inwardly moving cauſe, *viz.* the Love, and good Will of God) to juſtifie ſinners; For thereunto is God moved by what Jeſus Chriſt hath done, and ſuffered for them. *Forgiving one another (ſaith the Apoſtle) even as God for Chriſt's*

Chriſt's ſake hath forgiven you, Eph. 4. 32. Laſtly, From what hath been ſaid may alſo be gathered that the exalting, or magnifying of the righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt, or that the Infinite ſufficiency, worth, and dignity of the Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Chriſt, and that the infinite Love and Mercy of God in providing ſuch a Sacrifice, and ſuch a righteouſneſs for ſinners, might be made known to the World. I ſay, that is one of the great *Ends*, or *Final cauſes* of God's juſtifying a believing Sinner. Witneſs *Eph.* 2. 7. *That in the Ages to come he might ſhew the exceeding riches of his Grace, in his kindneſs towards us through Chriſt Jeſus.*

The righteouſneſs of Chriſt being thus upon the matter all in all, in the buſineſs of *Juſtification*, not only the *material*, but the *formal*, the *Procatarctical*, the *meritorious*, the *Final* cauſe of Juſtification (under ſeveral notions and conſiderations) it will follow that they who deny *Imputed* righteouſneſs, and conſequently the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, which is thereby intended, do lay the Ax of their Error, to the very root of the Doctrine of *Juſtification* (almoſt the greateſt Doctrine in all Chriſtianity) and do threaten to cut it down, both Root and Branch. For take away the *Material*, *Formal*, *Meritorious*, *Procatarctical*, *Final*, and *Inſtrumental* cauſes of Juſtification (for if the *object* of Faith, *viz.* the righteouſneſs of Chriſt be taken away, the *Act* muſt needs ceaſe; and ſo *Faith*, the *Inſtrument* of Juſtification, muſt fall to the ground.) I ſay, take away all theſe cauſes

of

of *Juſtification*, and what will remain? Scarce ſo much as were the remains of *Jezebel*, *whom when they went to bury*, 2 King. 9. 35. *they found no more of her than the ſkul and the feet, and the palms of her hands, ſo that* (as it was Propheſied by *Elijah*) *they ſhall not ſay this is* Jezebel; that is, they ſhould not know her to be the ſame; or to allude to what is ſaid of *Dagon*, in 1 *Sam.* 5. 4. *And the Head of* Dagon, *and both the palms of his Hands were cut off upon the Threſhold, only the ſtump of* Dagon *was left to him.* So the oppoſers of Chriſt's imputed righteouſneſs do leave ſcarce ſo much as a ſtump of the Doctrine of Juſtification.

And as it was ſaid of *Dagon*, that he was fallen upon his Face to the ground, ſo the Adverſaries of *Imputed* righteouſneſs have laid the Doctrine of Juſtification flat upon its face, (as it were) ſo that according to them we cannot know it to be what it is, or ſay, *This is juſtification.* The righteouſneſs whereby we are *juſtified*, and wherewith we are *ſanctified* are ſo confounded, and made one and the ſame, the *Covenant of Works*, and the *Covenant of Grace* made ſo like each other, as to differ but in degree; one exacting a perfect, the other accepting an imperfect, ſincere Obedience for our ſaving righteouſneſs before God, *Proteſtant*, and *Popiſh* Doctrine ſo blended, or rather *Proteſtantiſm* (or what is ſo called) ſo conform'd to *Popery*, ſo many of the main cauſes of *Juſtification* deſtroy'd at once; Juſtification ſo dwindled away to almoſt nothing to what had wont to be made

made of it, that we are in no ſmall danger of becoming more corrupt than the Papiſts themſelves in the great Doctrine of Juſtification: If the Enemies of Chriſt's imputed righteouſneſs ſhall proceed at ſuch a rate as Mr. *Sh.* has begun.

CCIX.

One good way to be eſtabliſhed in the Doctrine of Chriſt's imputed righteouſneſs, and preſerved from the damnable errors afore ſaid (for ſo I muſt call them) is to take heed how we deny the *Imputation*, or at leaſtwiſe the *Infection* and *Inherency* of *Original ſin*. Be eſtabliſhed in the belief of imputed ſin, and you will never ſtagger at the Doctrine of *Imputed righteouſneſs*. For who ever did deny the latter who did not firſt doubt the former? Now, the Infection or pollution of our Natures by Original Sin, me-thinks is evident from this Argument, and Conſideration amongſt others. If we were not born in ſin, and Conceived in Iniquity, we ſhould have an indifferency to good or evil, no more propenſion to evil than to good, we ſhould be as ductile, and pliable to what is good, as to what is evil, conſequently, as we had more incentives from without, more inducements, more advantages, more helps and conducements to one than to the other, we ſhould cloſe with that, whether good, or evil. As a man that walks abroad for his pleaſure, being perfectly indifferent which way he walks, Eaſt, or Weſt; let a Friend come and deſire him to go with

with him Eaſtward or Weſtward, that way that he deſires him to go with him he will go, becauſe before he was perfectly indifferent which way he went. He was like a pair of Scales hanging in *æquilibrio*, in an equipoiſe, if but a grain or two be caſt into either of them preſently that Scale is turned; I ſay, the Scale is preſently turned on that ſide, becauſe before they were juſt even. So would it be with Men were they like to two even Scales, as to good and evil, neither of which did in the leaſt preponderate (as they would Naturally be if there were no pollution by Original Sin) the leaſt grain, or moment of reaſon, and of inducement caſt in on either ſide would cauſe the Scale to turn on that ſide, had they ever ſo little more of Example, Counſel, Encouragement, Intereſt, or other Inducement to be, and to do good, than to be, and to do evil; they would certainly be, and do that which were good. But woful Experience tells us that it often proves quite otherwiſe. For how many Children have we ſeen and known, whoſe Parents from their very Child-hood have taken all poſſible care to ingage them in, and for the wayes of God, ſetting excellent Example before them, and ſuffering them to ſee no other, giving them the beſt Counſel they could, ſhewing them what was good, and what was not; the uglineſs and danger of ſin, the beauty and profitableneſs of Holineſs, threatning and terrifying them in caſe they did amiſs; yea, correcting of them now, and then, incouraging them by large promiſes if they did well, and by

frequent great rewards as oft as they [illegible] well doing, giving them the best Books [illegible] the best Company to keep, [illegible] continually, and yet after all this, those Children, or some of them, have betaken themselvs to ill courses, and run into all excess of riot, though Parents have done all that ever they could to keep down the Weeds of Sin, and to sow and cherish the Seeds of Virtue and goodness in them from time to time. If such Children had not been Naturally propense to evil, and averse to good, or propense to evil, and not to good, upon all those helps and advantages unto being good, they would certainly have prov'd so: It was therefore doubtless the Corruption of their Natures (otherwise called *Original* sin) which made them break all those bonds, and cast all those Cords from them, which would otherwise have held them to the performance of their Duty, and unto keeping Consciences void of offence towards God and Men. Never tell me that any man hath as much mind to do one thing as another, when a hundred times so much perswasion cannot prevail upon him to do the one, as will prevail upon him to do the other. When Scales are even, a few grains added to either of them, will cause that side to turn, and to weigh down: but where it is so that many *Ounces*, and *Pounds* will not cause one of the Scales to out-weigh the other, 'tis most certain they are not even, but one Scale doth much proponderate the other. Where ground is plain and level, the way backward

and

and forward are both alike eaſie, but when it is hard to go, and eaſie to come back, is a ſign the ground is Hilly and uneven. Finding therefore that the doing of good is to men Naturally difficult and uneaſie like going up a ſteep Hill, and that to do evil is eaſie to men, like coming down the Hill; 'tis manifeſt that the Nature of man is not indifferent to good and evil, but averſe to good, and propenſe to evil. When Men preſume to deny a thing ſo evident in the ſight of Experience, as is the pollution of our Natures by Original ſin, becauſe they cannot ſatisfie themſelves touching the way and manner how it it is conveyed (as if men ſhould deny that the River *Nilus* ever had any ſtreams, or that there was ever ſuch a River, becauſe they could never find out it's Head) no wonder if they make bold alſo to deny what they never ſaw, and felt (as they have done the other) *viz.* the *Imputed* Righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt. On the other hand, whoſoever is duly ſenſible of the great pollution of his *Nature*, as well as of his *Life*, and of Original depravation as well as of defilement by actual ſins, will cry out for the Robe of Chriſt's Imputed Righteouſneſs to cover his manifold defects and deformities, and never dare to truſt to ſuch filthy rags as he finds his own Righteouſneſs to be.

CCX.

There is ſo great a connection betwixt the Doctrine of Chriſt's *Satisfaction*, and that of *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, and ſo great a depend-

ance of the latter upon the former, that whosoever is hearty and ſtedfaſt in the belief of Chriſt's *Satisfaction*, or having made attonement and expiation for the ſins of Believers by his blood, muſt either not underſtand *Conſequences*, or be hearty alſo in the belief of the Mediatory *Righteouſneſs* of Chriſt it's being *Imputed* to Believers, and their being juſtified before God upon that account, God looking upon them as having ſatisfied his Juſtice though not in their own Perſons, yet in, and by Chriſt their *Surety*, and therefore pronouncing them diſcharged from guilt and righteous to Eternal Life. If Chriſt's Satisfaction be accepted of God for believers, and they accepted with God upon account thereof, then is his Satisfaction, or Righteouſneſs *Imputed* to them, for that is the meaning of *Imputed*, as I have elſe-where explained. But if Chriſt's Satisfaction be not accepted of God for believers, or they accepted with God for it, then they are never the better for it, they have no real benefit and advantage by it. If a man pay a thouſand pounds to another man's Creditor, to whom he owes as much as that comes to, but never tells him, that he pays that mony on behalf of that other man, or would have him look'd upon to be now out of Debt, and to have given Satisfaction by his hand; I ſay, if ſuch a thing be not expreſſed, he to whoſe Creditor that thouſand pounds was paid, ſhall be never the better for it. Let no man take the boldneſs to deny *Imputed* Righteouſneſs, or the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs

teouſneſs to Believers, till he hath firſt acquired the impudence to deny the ſatisfaction of Chriſt alſo. For he that denies the former, do's by *conſequence* (that is, in a mask and vizard) deny the latter alſo, which viſibly, and with open face he is aſhamed, or afraid to do.

CCXI.

The apprehenſion of approaching Death opens almoſt every man's eyes that profeſſeth himſelf a Chriſtian, to ſee the neceſſity of an *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, even theirs who were ready to deride it whilſt they lookt upon the evil day as far off. Bp. *Dounam*, in his book of *Juſtification*, p. 2003. tells us, *Many who have lived Papiſts, have in this moſt weighty point died Reformed Catholicks. And to this purpoſe* (ſaith he) *there is extant amongſt them in divers Books, a Form of viſiting the ſick, wherein both the Paſtor is directed what to ſay, and the ſick perſon what to anſwer. The Paſtor therefore having demanded theſe Queſtions. Brother, Doſt thou rejoyce that thou ſhalt die in the Faith? Doſt thou confeſs that thou haſt not liv'd ſo well as thou oughteſt? Doth it repent thee? Haſt thou a will to repent if thou hadſt ſpace of life? Doſt thou believe that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt died for thee? Doſt thou believe that thou canſt not be ſaved but by his death? And having received affirmative anſwers to every Queſtion, he inforceth this Exhortation, that while his ſoul remaineth in him, he ſhould place his whole affiance in the death of Chriſt, and in no other thing: and that if God will judge him, if he ſhall ſay unto him, Thou art a*

ſinner, that thou haſt deſerved damnation, that he is angry with thee, he ſhould ſay; O Lord, I interpoſe the death of thy Son between me and thy judgment, between my ſins and thee, between me and my bad deſerts, between me and thine anger. So *Quæſtiones authore Anſelmo morientibus proponi ſolitæ per univerſum Chriſtianum orbem.* Bp. *Uſher*, de Succeſſ. p. 194. *& Reſponſio ad Jeſuitam*, p. 513. *Chemnitius his Examin*, part. 1. p. 243. *Card. Hoſij Confeſſ. Petricovienſ.* c. 74. fol. 143, &c. In the Edition Printed at *Venice*, there are theſe two Queſtions. *Doſt thou believe that thou ſhalt come to glory, not by thy own merits, but by the virtue, and merit of Chriſt's paſſion?* And a little after, *Doſt thou believe that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt died for our Salvation, and that no man can be ſaved by his own merits, or by any other means but by the merit of his paſſion? unto both which an Affirmative Anſwer was made. Sic ordo baptizandi cum modo viſitandi, Impreſſ. Venete. Anno* 1575. *fol.* 34. See *Perkins* his *Reformed Catholick*, p. 276. Surely the truth of that Doctrine is much to be queſtioned, in which Papiſts themſelves, though they inſtruct people the greateſt part of their *life time*, yet dare not but teach them otherwiſe when they come to die.

CCXII.

Many have decry'd Imputed Righteouſneſs, and profeſſed to expect Salvation, or Juſtification, only by that righteouſneſs which is *Inherent* in themſelves, who yet have really and in good earneſt had no *Inherent* Righteouſneſs to pretend

tend to. In this number were the Phariſes of old; who ſeemed to think themſelves whole and not to ſtand in need of Chriſt for their Phyſitian, and yet God knows they were far from being ſo. For whilſt they pai'd tithe of Mint, and Anniſe, and Cummin, they omitted the weightier matters of the Law; Judgment, Mercy, and Faith: Whereupon Chriſt cryed out, *Woe unto you Scribes, and Phariſees Hypocrites*, &c. *Mat.* 23. 23. & *Luke* 20. 47. Chriſt ſpeaks thus of them: *Which devour Widdows houſes, and for a pretenſe make long Prayers.* The Scribes, and Phariſees were great contemners of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and pretendedly confident of their own, *God I thank thee* (ſaid the Phariſee) *that I am not as other men are, or as this Publican: I faſt twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I poſſeſs.* They boaſted much of their own Righteouſneſs; they were they *who juſtified themſelves before men*, but in the mean time, being ſuch as they were, they could not chuſe but know that they had indeed, and in truth, no Righteouſneſs to boaſt of.

CCXIII.

'Tis vehemently to be ſuſpected that ſome men have made ſo much the higher pretences unto being juſtified by their own Righteouſneſs becauſe they knew they had no Righteouſneſs of their own whereby to be Juſtified; ſo that their ſo doing was but a meer cloak, colour, and covert for their unrighteouſneſs: as who ſhould ſay, No man will ſuſpect us to be unrighteous, or ungodly (though we know our ſelves ſo to

be) ſo long as we bear the world in hand that we have ſuch confidence of our own Righteouſneſs, that we expect, and deſire no other Righteouſneſs to Juſtifie us, that we need not fly for refuge (as others do) to that which they call *Imputed Righteouſneſs*. As they who have no beauty, think themſelves moſt concern'd to *paint*, thereby to conceal, and cover their deformities; ſo they are moſt prone to pretend to a Righteouſneſs of their own, who have not the ſhadow of ſuch a Righteouſneſs to pretend to. A worthy Divine was heard to ſay, in his time, That *he would not for a thouſand pounds have been ignorant of the Lives and Converſations of men whoſe manner it was to cry down the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt Imputed, and to cry up their own Inherent Righteouſneſs. For* (ſaith he) *I might poſſibly have been drawn into the ſame Error with them, if I had found their lives exactly good, but what I have known by them, or ſeveral of them, has perfectly delivered me, ſaith he, from that temptation.* He thought he had found the emptieſt barrels in that reſpect, to give the greateſt ſound. It ſeems to be a maxime amongſt ſome men, that The leſs they are what is good and excellent in truth and in reality, the more they ought to ſeem or to appear to be ſo.

CCXIV.

There is hardly any one thing repreſented in, and by the word of God, more dangerous and fatal, or deſtructive to the ſouls of men and women, than to truſt, or to have truſted to their own

own righteouſneſs, and not to the righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt, which put to a believers account is call'd *Imputed Righteouſneſs*. I with that a few texts to that purpoſe might be well weighed by Mr. *Sherlock*, and others, *viz. Rom.* 9. 33. *Rom.* 10. 3. *Gal.* 3. 10. *Gal.* 5. 2, 4. *Rom.* 11. 6. *But Iſrael, which followed after the Law of righteouſneſs, hath not attained to the Law of righteouſneſs. Wherefore? Becauſe they ſought it not by Faith, but as it were by the works of the Law; for they ſtumbled at that ſtumbling ſtone,* (viz. *at Chriſt, and at the way of Juſtification, and Salvation by him.*) *For* (Rom. 10. 3.) *They being ignorant of God's righteouſneſs; and going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, have not ſubmitted themſelves to the righteouſneſs of God.* v. 4. *For Chriſt is the end of the Law for righteouſneſs to every one that believeth.* See alſo *Gal.* 3. 10. *For as many as are of the works of the Law* (*i. e.* as expect to be juſtified by the works of the Law) *are under the Curſe. Curſed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the Law to do them.* Now it is the Moral Law that is here ſpoken of, and of which he ſaith, *v.* 11. *But that no man is juſtified by the Law in the ſight of God is evident, for the Juſt ſhall live by Faith.* See alſo *Gal.* 5. 4. *Chriſt is become of none effect to you, whoſoever of you are juſtified by the law, ye are fallen from grace.* That he cannot be juſtified by the grace of God, who expects to be juſtified by his own works (& if not by grace then not at all) ſeems evident as from the forementioned Texts, ſo likewiſe from *Rom.* 11. 6. *And if by Grace, then it is no*

more

more of Works: otherwiſe Grace is no more Grace: But if it be of Works, then it is no more Grace: Otherwiſe Work is no more Work.

CCXV.

The danger of going about to eſtabliſh our own Righteouſneſs in point of Juſtification being repreſented ſo very great, thoſe Doctrines are vehemently to be ſuſpected which look that way, as leading towards an Error: to which, what *Solomon* ſaith of a Harlot, may be alluſively applyed, *Proverbs* 7. 27. *Her Houſe is the way to Hell, going down to the Chambers of Death.* As alſo what is ſaid *Proverbs* 9. 18. *He knoweth not that the dead are there, and that her Gueſts are in the depth of Hell.* I ſay, conſidering that, of this Error, as of the Strang Woman; it may be ſo ſaid, the ſafeſt way will be to take that counſel concerning it, that *Solomon* gives concerning the *path of the Wicked*, and *the way of Evil Men*, Prov. 4. 14, 15. *Enter not into it, avoid it, paſs not by it, turn from it, and paſs away.*

Whilſt we are all ſubject to Error (as we ſhall be in this life) it will be our wiſdome, if we muſt Err at all, to be ſure to Err on the ſafeſt ſide, where we ſhall not endanger being burned our ſelves, for razing the Foundation; but only having our work burned, for building Hay, and Stubble upon it. Now certainly it is better to aſcribe too much to the Grace of God, and to the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, than too little; and

to

to attributte too little to our own Works, and Righteouſneſs, than too much. But I hope I have done neither.

'Tis ſafer venturing to Err with *Puritans*, ſuch of them as have been great Aſſertors of Juſtification by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt *Imputed*, than to Err with *Papiſts*, who uſe to oppoſe it in their Health, though many of them have owned it upon their Death-beds.

OF

OF

ACQUAINTANCE

WITH THE

PERSON of CHRIST:

That there is ſuch a Thing, and that it is moſt deſireable.

THat we ſhould not, or need not acquaint our ſelves with the *Law*, and *Goſpel* of Chriſt, as well as with his *Perſon*; or that we ought to acquaint our ſelves with the Perſon of Chriſt, over, and above what is revealed concerning it in his Goſpel, are two Aſſertions that, to the beſt of my knowledg, did never drop from the Mouth, or Pen, of any man that I have heard, or read: But that we ought to be acquainted not only with the *Law*, and *Goſpel* of Chriſt, but alſo with his *Perſon*, is a great, and manifeſt Truth, which Mr. *Sh.* do's not only ſeem to doubt of, but laughs to ſcorn; at leaſtwiſe (which comes all to one) derides thoſe (*ad nauſeam uſque*) who make any pretenſions thereunto.

To

To know Christ (saith Mr. *Sh.* p. 37.) *is to understand the Declaration which he hath made of God's Will to the World; that is, the Gospel which he Preached.*

This he Writes *Exclusively*, as if that were the only knowledge of Christ which any man ought to seek after, and whatsoever more than that any man pretended to were but meer fancy and delusion. In p. 32. he saith, *God was seen in Christ. He that hath seen me hath seen my Father, that is, in plain words, the will of God was plainly declar'd to the World by Christ.* In p. 37. Mr. *Sh.* hath these words. *After this plain account wherein the knowledge of Christ consists* (on which he had spent about twelve pages) *the sum of which is that to know Christ is to understand his Gospel, which contains all those Revelations which he made of God's Will.* Now, if that be the sum total of all the knowledge of Christ, *viz. To understand all the Revelations which he hath made of God's Will*, then to know his *Person* is no part of that acquaintance with Christ which we ought to press after. If Dr. *Owen* had said that the sum of our knowledge of Christ is to know his *Person*, and that, after a long Discourse of *Acquaintance with Christ*, and wherein it did consist, you would, and justly might have charged him with rejecting Acquaintance with the *Laws*, and *Gospel* of Christ. But you have never found (nor I believe ever shall) Dr. *Owen* so gross, and erroneous as that would amount to. In p. 38. he saith, that those words, *Col.* 2. 3. *In him dwell all the treasures of*

Wisdom

Wiſdom and knowledge, are meant of the Doctrines and Revelations of Chriſt. But why ought we not rather to underſtand them of his *Perſon*? When it is ſaid, *Col.* 2. 9. *In him*, that is, in Chriſt, *dwelleth all the fulneſs of the God-head bodily*; and to like purpoſe, *Col.* 1. 19. Ought we not to apply it to his *Perſon*? When it is ſaid, *Pſal.* 68. 18. *Thou haſt received gifts for men that the Lord might dwell amongſt them*; is it not to be underſtood of his *Perſon*, not of his *Doctrines and Revelations?* Why then may not, *Col.* 2. 3. be alſo meant of the *Perſon* of Chriſt, eſpecially conſidering thoſe two Texts, *viz.* 1 *Cor.* 1. 24. *Chriſt the Power of God, and the Wiſdom of God*, and v. 24. *Of him are ye in Chriſt Jeſus, who of God is made to us Wiſdom*, &c. both which Texts muſt neceſſarily be intended of the *Perſon* of Chriſt. He diſcovereth his inconſiſtency with himſelf in drawing a whole *Scheme of Divinity*, ſuch as himſelf approveth, and after that ſaying; p. 86. l. *ult. All this we learn from our Acquaintance with Chriſt his Perſon.* If there be no ſuch thing how comes he to draw a *Scheme* of Divinity after his own heart from thence? (of which he tells us again, p. 96.) But afterwards he inſinuates that Acquaintance with the *Perſon* of Chriſt is a kind of *materia prima*, capable of all Forms, or a Noſe of wax, that may be turned every way, or a Foundation on which we may build what we pleaſe, as well Error, as Truth; Truth, as Error, whereas I had thought the old Rule had been true, *viz. Poſito uno abſurdo ſequuntur Mille*, or that nothing

thing but abſurdities can well be founded upon abſurdities; but he it ſhould ſeem can bring *a clean thing out of an unclean*, and cauſe Truth to be born of Error, his own ſuppoſedly Orthodox *Scheme of Divinity* to be founded upon the notion of *Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt*; for he ſaith, p. 97. *I muſt adviſe them to quit this way, as the which will ſerve others as well as themſelves.* It is the Doctrine of Acquaintance with the *Perſon* of Chriſt that he would have men quit, but that he is greatly to blame for giving men that advice, I ſhall forthwith prove, *viz.* by the following Arguments.

1. If Jeſus Chriſt be a *Perſon* then we ought to be acquainted with his *Perſon* (for we ought to acquaint our ſelves with what Chriſt is, ſo far as poſſibly we can.) But Jeſus Chriſt is a *Perſon*. If Chriſt be not a Perſon there cannot be three Perſons in the God-head, for they that own a Trinity in Unity, do all own Chriſt to be one (and the ſecond) *Perſon* in the God-head, and if he were not one there were but two.

2. *Chriſt is the expreſs Image of his Fathers Perſon*, Heb. 1. 3.

3. The Name Chriſt is but ſeldome in all the Bible put for the *Church*, and it is but ſeldome put for the *Law and Goſpel of Chriſt*, and though you are pleaſed to ſay, p. 4. *That Chriſt is Originally the Name of an Office, which the Jews call the* Meſſias, *or one anointed by God*: Yet 'tis moſt certain that it is not in any one inſtance of Scripture the name of an *Office*. Now, there being but one more ſignification of the word Chriſt, accor-

according to you, in all the Bible, *viz.* *A Perſon inveſted with an Office*, p. 8. That muſt needs be the uſual, and general ſignification of the word *Chriſt*. Now, an *Office* is one thing, and an *Officer* is another thing, if *abſtracts*, and *concrets*, be not the ſame thing, *Ex. gr.* if it be one thing to be *wiſe*, and another thing to be *wiſdom* it ſelf, or to be *good*, and to be *goodneſs* it ſelf. If then the name *Chriſt* doth ſignifie a *Perſon inveſted with an Office*, then it ſignifies a *Perſon*, and ſomething more, *viz.* one in *Office*; Yea, that being the moſt uſual, and general ſignification of the name Chriſt, where ſomething in the context doth not point out another ſignification of it, it ought alwayes to be taken in that ſenſe, *viz.* for *a Perſon in Office*, or anointed to Office, one, or more, according to that known Axiom, *viz.* *Analogum per ſe poſitum ſumitur pro famoſiori analogato*, &c.

2. We ought to be acquainted with Chriſt *Himſelf*. Therefore with his *Perſon*. For the Perſon of Chriſt is (as you in your Book affirm more than once) Chriſt himſelf. (as your own Perſon is your ſelf.) Is it not of the Perſon of Chriſt that St. *Paul* ſpeaketh, *Phil.* 3. 10. when he ſaith, *that I may know him, and the power of his Reſurrection*, &c.

3. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with Chriſt Crucified; for, ſaith the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 2. 2. *I determined to know nothing amongſt you ſave Jeſus Chriſt, and him Crucified*, &c. Now ſurely it was the *Perſon* of Chriſt, not his *Law* and *Goſpel* that was Crucified.

4. *Arg.*

4. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with Christ as he is God, or to know him to be such, and as he is such. But Christ as God is a *Person*, and was before ever he did assume the humane Nature. If we know not Christ to be God, how can we understand that Text, *Acts* 20. 28. *The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood?* Else how can we say to Christ, as *Thomas* did, *John* 20. 28. *My Lord, and my God?*

5. *Arg.* We ought to know Christ as *Man*, or the Man *Christ Jesus*. Now Christ as *Man* is a Person, for his Humane Nature is taken into oneness of subsistence, or of Personality with the Divine Nature, which is called the *Hypostatical Union.*

5. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with the *Nature* and *Attributes* of Jesus Christ. Now it is impossible for us to know the Attributes of Christ his Divine Nature, unless we know his *Person*; for his Attributes are *himself*, as the Scripture saith, *God is Love*, and himself, and his *Person* (according to your self) are all one. Though I cannot demonstrate that *Decreta Dei sunt Deus ipse* (as some have said) nor answer their Objections against it, who say, that *God* is *Ens necessarium*, a Being which cannot but be, but his *decrees* are *Voluntary* Acts, and some of them at least might not have been, *Ex. gr.* God might not have decreed that Christ should dye for Sinners (for he was under no necessity to make such a decree) yet sure I am the *Attributes* of God, and consequently

of God the Son, are God himſelf. God is Holineſs it ſelf, and Holineſs in the abſtract is God; and ſo God is power it ſelf, and Power it ſelf, or Infinite Power, is God himſelf. If then we muſt be acquainted with the Attributes of Chriſt we muſt be acquainted with himſelf, and himſelf, and his Perſon are all one, as you your ſelf have acknowledged once, and again.

6. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with Chriſt as he is repreſented to us in the Scriptures. But there Chriſt is repreſented to us as a *Perſon.* He ſpeaks to his Spouſe the Church as ſuch throughout the *Canticles*, and ſhe ſpeaks to him as ſuch, *Cant.* 1. 2. *Let him kiſs me*, &c. *for thy Love is better than Wine*, &c. And v. 4. *The King hath brought me into his Chamber* (meaning Chriſt.) To mention all thoſe places where Chriſt is ſpoken of as a *Perſon* were to tranſcribe a great part of the Bible. And for all that muſt we not pretend to, or ſeek after any acquaintance with his *Perſon?* Muſt we ſhut our eyes againſt a great part of what is ſpoken concerning Chriſt in the Holy Scriptures?

7. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with Chriſt as he is repreſented to us in the *Articles of our Creed*; But there he is repreſented to us as a *Perſon.* Witneſs theſe paſſages, *And in Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, who was Conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, born of the Virgin* Mary, *ſuffered under* Pontius Pilate, *was Crucified, dead and Buried, deſcended into Hell, roſe again the third day, aſcended up to Heaven, ſitteth at the right hand of God,*

God, from thence he ſhall come to judge the Quick and the Dead. Now, the fore-mentioned Expreſſions are applicable only to his *Perſon*, not to his *Law* and *Goſpel*, and therefore we ought to be acquainted with the *Perſon* of Chriſt, if we ought to know, and believe the one half (for thereabouts they are) of the *Articles* of our *Creed*.

8. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with the *Perſon* of God the Father, and therefore alſo with the *Perſon* of God the Son. For there is the ſame Reaſon for both. What but the *Perſon* of God the Father, and of the two other Perſons of the Bleſſed Trinity is meant, *Job* 22. 21. where 'tis ſaid, *Acquaint thy ſelf with him, and be at peace?* By *Him* cannot be meant the *Law*, and *Goſpel* of God, witneſs *v.* 22. *Receive, I pray thee, the Law from his mouth*: what, the Law from the mouth of his Law? What ſenſe were that? and *v.* 23. *If thou return to the Almighty thou ſhalt be built up*, &c. It was the Almighty then, by which is meant God himſelf, with whom he was counſelled, *v.* 21. to acquaint himſelf, for of the ſame Perſon he ſpeaks in theſe three verſes, *&c.*

9. *Arg.* We ought to have, and to hold *Communion*, and *Fellowſhip*, with Chriſt himſelf, or with the *Perſon* of Chriſt,: *Ergo*, we ought to be acquainted with his Perſon. *Fellowſhip*, and *Acquaintance* cannot eaſily be ſeparated. Acquaintance, if it doth not precede Society, and Fellowſhip betwixt man, and man, it do's always accompany it, or follow upon it. For how

can we otherwiſe chuſe than be acquainted with the Perſons of thoſe with whom we have intimately converſed time after time? I muſt needs know ſuch a one, ſay we, having converſed with him ſo often as I have done, &c. Now Fellowſhip, and Communion with the Perſon of Chriſt, or with Chriſt himſelf we all ought to ſeek after; for we cannot walk in the light, but we muſt have it, 1 *John* 1. 7. and walk in the light, *viz.* of Grace, and Holineſs we ought, and muſt: and of ſuch St. *John* ſaith *v.* 3. *And truly our fellowſhip is with the Father, and the Son Chriſt Jeſus.* What with his *Law* and *Goſpel* only? as by reading, and hearing, and underſtanding of it? All that wicked men may do, and have. Therefore with *himſelf* doubtleſs, or with his *Perſon*, in, and by means of his Ordinances. Read *Pſal* 63. 1. *O God, thou art my God, early will I ſeeek thee, my ſoul thirſteth after thee.* v. 2. *To ſee thy power and thy glory ſo as I have ſeen thee in thy Sanctuary.* So that God himſelf is to be ſought, yea to be ſeen and enjoyed in his Ordinances. Read alſo *Exod.* 25. 22. *And there will I meet with thee, and commune with thee from above the Mercy-ſeat, from between the Cherubims which are upon the Ark of the Teſtimony of all things which I give thee in commandment,* &c. See alſo *Exodus* 20. 24. *In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bleſs thee,* &c. May we not infer that Communion which Believers have, and ought to have with Chriſt himſelf in Ordinances, from *Rev.* 1. 13.? *And in the midſt of the ſeven Candleſticks one like*

to

to the Son of Man, &c. To name but one text more for this purpose, in *Mat.* 18. 20. saith our Saviour, *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* From all these places I gather that *Communion* with the *Person* of Christ may be had, and is promised upon certain conditions; and from thence I infer, That Acquaintance with the person of our Saviour (which is an inseparable concomitant or consequent of such communion) may be had also, and ought to be sought after, *&c.*

Surely I need say no more (nay have said more than I did need) to convince any man that he has done very sinfully in disowning, and deriding so real, and sacred a thing, as is *Acquaintance with the Person of Christ*, though under pretence of zeal for his Law and Gospel. Now whereas I find these two words, *viz.* the *Law* & *Gospel* of our Saviour often put together in Mr. *Sh*'s. book, as if the latter did signifie more than the former, give me leave to observe by the way, that one of them might be spared: for they are one and the same in sense, and signification, for that the *Gospel* of Christ is his *Law*, and the *Law* of Christ is his *Gospel*: For the Gospel of Christ is not all made up of *Promises*, but partly of *Precepts*. Was it not the sum and substance of the *Gospel*, or *Covenant of Grace*, which *Paul* and *Silus* answered to the Jailor. *Acts* 16. 30. who asked them, *Sirs, what must I do to be saved?* v. 31. *Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.* The *Covenant of Grace*, as well as other Covenants, is *Promissum sub condi-*

tione, it consists as well of a *Law* enjoyning a *Duty*, as of a *Promise* encouraging thereunto. Neither is the Law of Christ without the Promise, nor the Promise of Christ without his Law, but they go both hand in hand together. Therefore we read of those *who obey not* (as well as who believe not) *the Gospel of Christ*: now a Law is the object of disobedience, *where no Law is there can be no Transgression*: as where there is no promise there can be no Diffidence or unbelief, *&c.* I have said enough, I think, to prove that the *Law*, and *Gospel* of our Saviour are συνωνυμία or Synonymous expressions: but having been guilty of *Substraction* in other passages of his book (even to such a degree as to substract, or deny Acquaintance with the Person of Christ) who knows whether to make amends for that, he has not here run upon *Multiplication* more than he needed to have done, like the Papists, who presuming to take away one of the ten Commandments, *split* another single Commandment into two, that still they may make up the same number. But if I do not overlook greater faults than *Tautologies* in the Book that I am dealing with, I think I shall never have done with it. My next work shall be to prove that *Acquaintance with the Person of Christ* (which our unhappy Antagonist has so often let fly against) is not only a real, and attainable thing, but also greatly *desireable*, yea, and highly *advantagious*, and upon what grounds it is so.

" *First*, Acquaintence with the person of our Saviour is to be desired in order to enkindling,

and

and encreaſing Love and Affection in us towards him. *Ignoti nulla Cupido.* We may love Chriſt though we never ſaw him, but we cannot love him if we never knew him. *Thy name is as Oyntment poured forth,* Cant. 1. 3. *therefore do the Virgins love thee*; implying, that if the name of Chriſt had been as ointment cloſe ſhut up in a Box, and not diſcovering it ſelf, either by ſight, or ſavour, they could not have loved him. When Ointments ſend forth their ſavour, we know what they are. Now ſaith the Text, *Becauſe of the ſavour of thy good Ointment therefore do they love thee,* Cant. 1. 3. As they ſay *There is nothing in the underſtanding that was not firſt in the ſenſes:* it is as true, *There is nothing in the affections, that was not firſt in the underſtanding.* If then we ought to love the Perſon of Chriſt, for certain we ought to acquaint our ſelves with his Perſon, and not with his Goſpel only, or rather not with that part of his Goſpel only, which makes no mention of his Perſon. Who dares to ſay that the Perſon of Chriſt ought not to be *delighted* in, yea that it is not a great duty to delight our ſelves in the *Perſon,* and Perſonal excellencies of our Saviour? If ſo I am ſure we ought to be acquainted therewithal; for to delight in that whereof we are perfectly ignorant, is utterly impoſſible.

Delighting, and rejoycing are neer akin: they ſeem to differ but in degree. Now that it is a duty to rejoyce in Chriſt Jeſus may be gathered from ſundry texts, *viz. Phil.* 3. 1, 3. and *Phil.* 4. 4. *Rejoyce in the Lord always, and again I ſay rejoyce:*

joyce: *viz.* in the Lord Christ; for that *he* is meant may, be collected from the next verse, *viz. The Lord is at hand.* But how can we rejoyce in one we know not, or with whom we have no acquaintance? *In whom believing* (saith the Scripture) *we rejoyce*: intimating that we could not rejoyce in Christ unless we knew him. For, saith the Apostle, *How shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard?* Whose doubt is it whether it be our duty and excellency to set a high *price*, and *value* upon Christ? Is it not said that *to them that believe Christ is precious?* Yea, is it not as distinguishing a Character of a true Believer as can be given, that he is one that valueth Jesus Christ above all the world, even then when he has fair opportunities to enjoy abundance of the World, and great probability that he may long continue so to do? Is not the *Merchant man* spoken of *Mat.* 13.45. *Who when he had found one Pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it*, an emblem of every true Christian setting forth the high esteem, and value for Christ, which every such person hath? If so, It must needs be a great priviledge to be endowed with power from on high to prefer Jesus Christ above our greatest joys, and enjoyments in this world. Now that we can never do unless we be acquainted with him. We can value no man till we know him, and his worth. To one that knows the worth of a barly corn, but not of a Jewel; a Jewel may seem less worth than a barly-corn. The Daughters of *Jerusalem* hearing the Church say that *she was sick*

of

of Love, to Christ, made answer, *What is thy Beloved more than another Beloved?* But the Spouse that was acquainted with the Person of Christ, replyed; *My Beloved is white and ruddy, the chiefest amongst ten thousand*, and so continueth to commend him to the end of that Chapter. Whence did that prizing and admiring of the Person of Christ result but from her having that Acquaintance with him which others had not? (who were ready through their Ignorance to say, *He hath no Form, nor Comliness, there is no Beauty that we should desire him.*) Christ *to the Jews* that knew him not was a *stumbling block, and to the Gentiles foolishness, but unto them which were called*, (viz. to the saving knowledge of himself) *Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God.*

A Fourth Priviledge resulting from our Acquaintance with the *Person* of Christ is, that thereby we shall be induced, and I had almost said inforced to trust him; For they that know Christ as they ought to know him cannot but trust him. As there are some Truths which the mind of a man cannot chuse but assent to, at the first hearing, which do *Cogere Assensum*, so there are, some such indisputable objects of Love, and Trust, that they who know them to be what they are cannot but Love, and trust them. Such a one is Christ. *They that know thy Name will trust in thee.* Now, not the Word and Promises, but the Person of Christ is the *first* Object of our trust, and the *reason* of our trust: for what is the reason that we trust any mans word, but because

cauſe we know himſelf to be honeſt, and able to make it good? Who regards the Promiſe of a meer Stranger, not knowing who he is, or as they ſay, whence he comes, and whether he will? *Paul* therefore truſted Chriſt with the invaluable Jewel of his Soul, becauſe he was well acquainted with him, 2 *Tim.* 1. 12. For, ſaith he, *I know whom I have believed, and am perſwaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him againſt that day.* Who would loſe the benefit of being able chearfully to commit his Soul into the hands of Chriſt, for all Eternity, to excuſe the Labour, and pains of being acquainted with him? Or what wiſe man would intruſt any matter of great concernment in the hands of one of whom he has no knowledge?

To paſs on to a *Fifth.* Is it no Priviledge that by how much more we know the Perſon, and Perſonal Excellencies of Chriſt, by ſo much more ſhall we know how to *pleaſe*, and *imitate* him? We cannot but pleaſe Chriſt when we imitate, and conform to him. Now, the knowledge of Chriſt is a *conforming*, or rather *transforming* knowledge, 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. *We all with open face, as in a Glaſs beholding the Glory of God, are changed into the ſame Image.* If we ſee Chriſt as he is, we cannot but be like him, 1 *John* 3. 2. A full Viſion of Chriſt will fully aſſimulate us to him, and ſo will a more imperfect Viſion, or knowledge of him, in a degree. The more we know the temper, and diſpoſition of any Friend, the better we know how to ſuit and accommodate our ſelves to him, and how to give him

him content. 'Tis both our Duty and Excellency to conform to the will and Pattern of our Saviour, *to walk as he walked; and to be in the world as he was in the World*, 1 *John* 4. 17. and that we can never do, unleſs we know who he was, and how he behav'd himſelf when he was in this World. He that would *learn of Chriſt* (as he bids us) *to be meek and Lowly*, muſt firſt be acquainted with Chriſt as ſuch, or know aſſuredly that he was ſo.

Sixthly, By acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt, or with Chriſt himſelf (which you have told us comes all to one) we may come to know the *Image of Chriſt*, where, and in whomſoever we ſhall ſee it, and thereby be induced to love, and honour both it, and them. St. *John* did find it a great advantage to himſelf and others, that they did know and love the *Image* of Chriſt where they ſaw it. For, ſaith he, 1 *John* 3. 14. *We know that we have paſſed from Death to Life, becauſe we love the Brethren*, meaning, ſuch in whom the Image, and likeneſs of Chriſt did appear. Who can Love and value a *Copy* for it's likeneſs to the *Original*, unleſs he be acquainted with the Original to which it is like? If one man imitate another as exactly as he can, in Preaching, or otherwiſe, who can love him for ſo doing, unleſs he know, and prize the Perſon whom he imitates?

Seventhly, Mr. *Sherlock* himſelf ſeems to account it a great Duty, and Priviledge, to be acquainted with the *Goſpel* of Chriſt. Now, who knows not that it is impoſſible to be acquain-

quainted with the *Perſon* of Chriſt, and the circumſtances of his *Perſon*, *viz. Life*, *Death*, *Reſurrection*, &c. and not to be acquainted with a great part of his *Goſpel*, ſith a great part of the *Goſpel* is taken up in deſcribing to us who Chriſt was, what he did, and ſuffered; and for what ends, and purpoſes he did and ſuffered ſuch things?

Eighthly, Yea, more than ſo, Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt doth not only imply, and involve acquaintance with a great part of his *Goſpel*, but hath alſo a great tendency and influence both to *awe*, and *allure* us to the Obedience thereof. The knowledge of Chriſt as the Judge of Quick, and Dead, who will one day *come in flames of Fire to take Vengeance on them who obey not his Goſpel*, may awe us into Obedience, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, 2 *Cor.* 5. 11. *Knowing therefore the terrour of the Lord, we perſwade men.* He had ſaid in the verſe immediately fore going, *For we muſt all appear before the Judgment-ſeat of Chriſt*, &c. And ſith *Mercy* and *Majeſty* do both meet in Chriſt, and greet each other, ſurely there is much in that knowledge of his *Perſon*, as well to *invite*, and allure, as to *awe*, and affright us into the Obedience of his *Goſpel*. Elſe what meaneth that obteſtation of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 12. 1. *I beſeech you therefore, Brethren, by the Mercies of God that ye preſent your Bodies a Living Sacrifice, Holy, acceptable to God*, &c.

Ninthly, Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt according to what is revealed concerning

it

it in his Goſpel (and no man that Mr. *Sh.* writes againſt pretends to any other) will Antidote us againſt thoſe groſs Errors, and Hereſies which many have run into, as in reference to the Perſon of our Saviour, as *Simon Magus*, *Cerinthus*, *Marcion*, *Samoſatenus*, *Arius*, *Neſtorius*, and ſuch like; whereof ſome denyed his *Divinity*, others his *Humanity*; ſome the *Purity* of his Conception, others the truth of it: ſome confounded the two Natures, denying their diſtinction, others denying their *Union*, divided the Perſon, of one making two. Some ſaid he hath the *Body*, but not the *Soul* of Man; others, that he took an *Ethereal*, or Spiritual, not a true Body, and ſuch like. They are ſeconded at this day by *Antitrinitarians*, *Familiſts*, *Socinians*, &c.

An effectual Antidote againſt *Quakeriſm* is, I think, as neceſſary at this day as ſuch an one againſt the *Plague* would have been ſome years ſince: and certainly a due Acquaintance with the *Perſon* of Chriſt, and ſtedfaſt belief of what the Scripture ſaith concerning the *Perſon* of our Saviour, is as Sovereign an Antidote againſt the Peſtilent Doctrines of the *Quakers* as can be made uſe of. For who can be a *Quaker* (truly ſo called) who doth really believe what the Scripture hath revealed to us, as touching the *Perſon* of Chriſt? As namely, that Jeſus Chriſt is not a meer *Quality*, *Accident*, *or Principle*, or nothing elſe but *the Light* which is *within* every man, but a *real Perſon*, true God, and true Man, and that the Goſpel is a real *Hiſtory*, and true

true matter of Fact, in the Letter of it, as well as a profound *Myſtery*, with reference to the wiſe contrivance, and Excellent deſigns, and uſes thereof? The *Quakers* (like the *Familiſts* of old) turn the whole *Hiſtory* of the Goſpel, ſo far as concerns the Perſon of Chriſt into an *Allegory*, and by endeavouring to make nothing but a meer *Figure* of it, do make it a meer *Cypher*. Before I go any further I muſt take leave to tell Mr. *Sh.* that the courſe he takes is the High-way to *Quakeriſm*. For if men ſhall be derided for making mention of the *Perſon* of Chriſt, and whereſoever the name of Chriſt is found we ſhall generally be directed to underſtand thereby either the *Church*, or certain *Laws and Rules*, or above and before all, a certain Office (one, or more) how ſoon may the ſubtiler ſort of Quakers tell us that there is but a ſtep betwixt us and them, they can eaſily give us the Right hand of fellowſhip? They ſay that the *Light* of Nature, or Light within us (which is a great Law, or Syſtem of Laws) that is Chriſt. They ſay that *Conſcience* (that great *Office*, and Court of Judicature ſet up in every mans breaſt) that is *Chriſt*, and we (if of Mr. *Sherlock*'s mind) do ſay that *Chriſt* is primarily, and Originally the name of an Office. They ſay that Chriſt and we are all one, for every man is one and the ſame with the Light that is in him (for that Light is ſomething of our ſelves) and we ſay that Chriſt for the moſt part ſignifies either the Church, whereof our ſelves are a part, or certain Laws and Rules of Life, and ſuch is the Light

Light within us, or is the name of an Office, and has not the Light within us ſeveral Offices, as namely to accuſe, or excuſe; to condemn, or acquit, and comfort us, as the matter ſhall require? *&c.*

Thus whilſt every thing almoſt that is ſaid of Chriſt himſelf, we do interpret to belong to his *Law* and *Goſpel*, and do generally read the latter inſtead of the former (as if it were ſo in our Bibles) we ſhall be apt to forget that there is any ſuch *Perſon*, as Chriſt, and what that perſon has done and ſuffered for us, and be in a great preparedneſs to comply with the *Quakers*, who retain in effect nothing but the name of Chriſt, by which name they baptize, and intend nothing but the *Light within them*, or the *Law* of Nature. Could the groſſer ſort of *Quakers* but extirpate the Hiſtory and Doctrine of the *Perſon* of Chriſt, and bury them in perfect oblivion: I doubt not but they would think the greateſt part of their work were done, and then the Light of Nature might eaſily be ſet upon the Throne of Chriſt, and be generally accepted for the only Light that men ſhould turn to.

Tenthly, *Fellowſhip and Converſe* with Jeſus Chriſt is doubtleſs a great priviledge, for ſo St. *John* ſpeaks of it, 1 *John* 1. 3. and there is no queſtion to be made but that Communion and Fellowſhip with Chriſt is, and may be much facilitated, and farthered, by our Acquaintance with his Perſon. We ſcarce know how to converſe with thoſe to whom we are yet but ſtrangers; we hardly know what is fit and proper for us to

ſay

ſay to them, or how to take and conſtrue ſuch things as they ſpeak to us; whether they ſpeak as they think, or only to trye us, or whether they take in good part what we ſay to them. But when we diſcourſe thoſe perſons with whom we are intimately acquainted, we have as it were a Key to all they ſay; we eaſily underſtand their meaning if they ſay but a little, and can apply our ſelves to them with freedom and confidence. They who are well acquainted with dumb perſons, can underſtand their very *ſigns*, and motions, better it may be, than the articular words, and expreſſions of thoſe whom they never ſaw before.

Again, Acquaintance with the *Perſon* of Chriſt is as it were a door, an inlet to all ſorts of Graces, as namely, *Faith*, *Love*, *Humility*, *Repentance*, *Self denyal*, *Patience*, and what not? Faith in Chriſt is called *Knowledge*, Iſa. 53. 11. *By the knowledge of him ſhall he juſtifie many*, and ſo elſewhere, probably becauſe it is introduced by, and founded in the knowledge of Chriſt. Of *Love*, and *delight* in Chriſt, ſpringing from thence I ſpake before. To prove it will teach us *Humility*, I might alledge what *Job* ſaith to God *Now mine eyes have ſeen thee, therefore do I abhor my ſelf in* duſt and aſhes: alſo thoſe words of Chriſt, *Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly*. If the knowledg of Chriſt doth not promote *Repentance*, why is it ſaid, *They ſhall ſee him whom they have pierced, and mourn over him?* To know Chriſt to have been *oppreſſed and afflicted, yet he oponed not his mouth, as a ſheep before the ſhearers*

is

is dumb, &c. Isa. 58. 7. *Who when he was reviled, reviled not again, when he suffered he threatned not*, 1 Pet. 2. 23. Is it not a great Instance and lesson of *Patience*? when the Apostle saith, *Phil.* 2. 5, 6. *Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and became obedient, even to the Death of the Cross*; do's he not set before us the highest Example of *Self-denyal* that ever was? The like might be said of all other graces how they may be learnt by a due Acquaintance with Christ. Take one or two Texts for all, 2 *Pet.* 1. 2. *Grace and Peace be multiplied to you through the knowledge of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ.* What more full Expression than that of our Saviour, *John* 17. 3. *This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.* Intimating that a right knowledge of God, and Christ, is *seminally*, *virtually*, and *radically*, all Grace, and all that is necessary in order to Glory, *&c.*

Now, do all these great benefits and priviledges result from a right knowledge of the Person of Christ, and dare any man be so bold (I had almost said so desperate) as to laugh it to scorn? But Mr. *Sh.* tells us, p. 57. of a very bad scheme of Divinity (as he counts it) drawn from the Doctrine of Acquaintance with the Person of Christ, of which in his jearing Language he saith, *These are those great Gospel Mysteries, and Soul saving Truths which are learnt from an Acquaintance with Christ's Person, which his*

Goſpel is ſilent in. But how inconſiſtent is he with himſelf? For he has no ſooner ended that *mock-ſcheme*, which he puts upon thoſe whom he writes againſt, but he forthwith gives you another of his own, as ſound (to his thinking) as ſound can be, which he ſaith, *is much more plainly deducible from an Acquaintance with Chriſt's Perſon*, p. 81. How can that Doctrine be in it's ſelf deſpicable, falſe, and dangerous, from whence a whole Syſtem, or Scheme of *good Divinity* may be drawn? St. *James* ſaith, *Jam.* 3. 12. *One Fountain cannot ſend forth ſalt waters and freſh.* But Mr. *Sh.* has brought firſt Salt Waters, as he counts them, and then freſh, and both out of the ſame Fountain, *viz. Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt.* They had wont to ſay, *Can any good come out of* Nazareth? But with much more reaſon it may be ſaid, Can a fanſiful imaginary Doctrine, ſuch as he often intimates that of Acquaintance with Chriſt's Perſon to be, yield ſo many great Truths, as Mr. *Sh.* undertakes to infer from thence? for he ſaith, p. 87. *All this we learn from an Acquaintance with Chriſt's Perſon (as theſe men call it)* and then he adds (judge you how humbly) *And it were eaſie now to draw the whole Plot and deſign of Chriſtianity, to ſearch into the deep counſels of God, and to diſcover thoſe Principles and Motives he was Acted by, and the Infinite Wiſdom of the contrivance and the true methods of a ſinners recovery by Chriſt, and what that Homage and Worſhip is which we owe our Saviour.*

Now, if it be ſo, that all theſe great, and excellent

cellent Truths Mr. *Sh.* hath learnt, and could discover from *Acquaintance with Christ's Person*, adding (*as they call it*) never I think was a Doctrine so confessedly pregnant, and able instrumentally to lead a man into all truth, *even into the deep counsels of God, and the Infinite wisdom of his contrivances* (as he phraseth it) so kickt, and spurn'd at, so scorn'd and derided, as *Acquaintance with Christ's Person* has been by one that tells us he has learnt, and could discover so much from it. Admit some men should, or had drawn *a bad Scheme of Theology*, from a great, and wholsom truth (as foul stomacks corrupt the best of nourishments, and the very grace of God it's self is by some turned into wantonness) was it Lawful for Mr. *Sh.* to expose that great Truth, to scorn, and contempt, because others had so perverted it? (as some are said to wrest some passages in St. *Paul's* Epistles, to their own destruction.) By the same reason might he not go about to raze the only Foundation, our Lord *Jesus Christ*, because some even upon that have *built Hay and Stubble*. Had not Mr. *Sh.* prevented me by giving *a Scheme of Divinity*, of his own approving, deducible, as he tells us, from Acquaintance with Christ's Person, I could easily have given him another, such as I think he would not have offered to deny, the Truth, and goodness, either of the whole, or of any part thereof. I would have premised but two or three things, *viz.* 1. That Mr. *Sh.* by that *Acquaintance with the Person of Christ*, for pretending to which he derides those

whom he writes againſt, underſtands acquaintance with the *Circumſtances*, and *adjuncts* of the Perſon of Chriſt; as namely, with his *Life*, *Death*, *Reſurrection*, *Aſcenſion*, *Interceſſion*, as well as with himſelf immediately, for that appeareth, not only from p. 139, and 140. (where he expoſeth men for being ſo much tranſported ſometimes with the thoughts of *Chriſt Crucified*) other whiles with the apprehenſion of his Love to them, but more eſpecially from that *Scheme of Divinity* which himſelf deduceth from Acquaintance with Chriſt's Perſon; beginning p. 81. and reaching to p. 87. where he firſt treats of Chriſt his *Incarnation*, or coming into the World in the Nature of Man. Then he treats of the *good works*, and kind *Miracles* which he wrought in the World. *Then he mentions the World being made by Chriſt.* Afterwards he *ſpeaks of the Innocence, and Holineſs of his Life, of his Excellent Example.* By and by, *he mentions Chriſt his dying as a ſacrifice for ſin.* Then he ſpeaks of Chriſt his *Reſurrection from the dead*, and *his Aſcenſion to Heaven*, p. 86. *Of his Exaltation to the right hand of God, and of his Interceſſion.* All theſe things he refers to our *Acquaintance with Chriſt's Perſon*, adding (*as theſe men call it*) nay, it is eaſie to ſhew that he doth alſo thereunto refer *Acquaintance with the Divine*, as well *as Humane Nature of Chriſt, and with the ſeveral Excellencies, and perfections of both his Natures united in one Perſon.* For v. 82. ſaith he, *when we conſider this Mediator was no leſs than the Eternal ſon of God, by whom the worlds*

Worlds were made; (which words he brings into his discourse of Christs *Person*, &c.) Now if to be acquainted with Christs *Person*, be to be acquainted with his *Incarnation*, *Life*, good *Works*, *Death Resurrection*, *Ascension*, and *Intercession*, yea with his *Divine Nature*, and the several *Excellencies* and *Perfections* thereof, I dare be bold to say it were a very easie thing, from all of these put together, to deduce all the *Articles of our Creed*, the *Doctrine of a Deity*, and of *a Trinity in Unity* of the *Divine Attributes*, of *Creation*, *Providence*, and of all the *great* things which are revealed concerning Christ, as he was *Man*, of the *Church*, and of the *Communion of Saints* (for knowing Christ to be Head of the Church, I must know there is a *Church* that hath Communion amongst the several Members of it, as members of the Natural Body have each with other) Moreover, the Doctrine of *Forgiveness of sins*, of the *Resurrection of the Dead*, and *of the Life Everlasting*: Yea, a man cannot have so much knowledge of the *Person* of Christ, but he must needs know the substance of *the Ten Commandments*, and that he ought to conform thereunto; for he that knows how Christ walked, knows that Christians ought to walk as they have had him for an example, who loved God with all his heart, and his Neighbours (if men may so be called) as himself.

Now if *Acquaintance with Christ his Person*, according to that Description which Mr. *Sh.* himself doth make of it, do take in so great a

part of the moſt indiſputable Divinity that we have; *viz.* the ſum of the *Creed*, and *Decalogue*, who can but wonder at the extreme folly, and wickedneſs of any man, that ſhould preſume to write one line in contempt thereof? Had there been a generation of men who had pretended to have known the *bodily perſonage of Chriſt*, his *Stature*, *Complexion*, *Features*, &c. or to have had ſuch a viſion of Chriſt as *Stephen*, *Acts* 7. 55. *Who looking up to Heaven, ſaw Jeſus ſitting at the right hand of God*, or to have converſed with the perſon of Chriſt face, to face (as ſome have pretended to have done with Angels) to have expoſed ſuch wild Enthuſiaſts as thoſe, for their vain pretences, had been but to have ſerv'd them in their kind, and ſuch a rod as you have made might have ſuited well enough with the backs of ſuch fools: But to fall foul upon men for pretending, at leaſtwiſe to deſire, and to preſs after thoſe things which every good Chriſtian ought to deſire, and preſs after, and cannot do otherwiſe: *viz.* to *know Jeſus* Chriſt *himſelf*, and him *Crucified*, and riſing again from the dead, yea to *know the power of his death, and of his Reſurrection*, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks, *Phil.* 3. 9. was ſo daring an attempt, and ſo malicious an enterprize, as I have ſeldom heard the like. Had the men you write againſt preſs'd their hearers, and readers to a meer *ſpeculative* knowledg of Chriſt, only to fill their heads with *notions* concerning the nature, and excellencies of Chriſt, you might have blam'd them for that: But 'tis an *experimental* knowledg of Chriſt, which you

your

your ſelf do confeſs, theſe men pretend, and preſs to, *p.* 139. for there you ſay, *So theſe men talk alſo of an Experimental knowledge of Chriſt, the meaning of which is that this Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt, warms and heats their fancies, ſometimes they find great breakings of heart, &c.* The men you write againſt do preſs men ſo to know Chriſt, as to know him, is ſaid, *to be Life Eternal.* They would be underſtood as Divines ſay the Scriptures ſhould be, when they uſe words of knowledge, *verba notitiæ connotant affectum*, viz. to co-ſignifie ſuitable affections: They mind men of ſuch Texts as thoſe, 1 Joh. 2. 3. *Hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his Commandments*: And v. 4. *He that ſaith I know him, and keepeth not his Commandments, is a lyar.* And 1 Joh. 3. 6. *Whoſoever ſinneth hath not ſeen him, neither known him.* Now to abuſe Reverend Miniſters for preſſing men to a practical, experimental, affectionate knowledge of the *Incarnation*, *Life*, *Death*, *Reſurrection*, *Aſcenſion*, and *Interceſſion* of Chriſt, and of his great *Perſonal Excellencies*, both *Divine* and *Humane*, was a thing ſo bordering upon *Blaſphemy*, that hardly any thing can come nearer to it. There are two Errours more that I ſhould be glad to convince Mr. *Sherlock* of e're I conclude this Chapter; one is, that it was not *Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt* that he ſhould have expos'd more or leſs, (for that is a Sacred and moſt neceſſary thing) but he ſhould have reproved the profeſſed *rejecters*, and *refuſers* of acquaintance with the

Laws and *Goſpel* of Chriſt: He ſhould have ſaid, Here come they who ſay unto Chriſt, *This man ſhall not Reign over us. Come, let us break his Bonds, and caſt his Cords from us.* Here come they who ſay unto God, *Depart from us, we do not deſire the knowledge of thy ways.* You ſhould have remembred, that *Chriſt will come in flames of fire to take vengeance on them that know not God*; and therefore ſhould have found fault with them *that obey not the Goſpel of Chriſt*, not with them who ſtir up themſelves and others to know Chriſt, yea his *Perſon*: for of that *Paul* ſpeaks, when he ſaith, *that I may know him, and the Power of his Death*, &c. You have plainly ſet the Saddle upon the wrong Horſe, and muſt take more heed another time. Laſtly, Mr. *Sh.* hath built all his long Diſcourſe about *Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt*, upon a falſe and ſandy Foundation, *viz.* a meer Dream of his own; as if Dr. *Owen* did go about to ſet up a *Religion of the Perſon of Chriſt*, in oppoſition to the *Religion of his Law and Goſpel*; which I dare ſay never entered into his heart to do, nor can any ſuch thing, with any colour of reaſon, be gathered from thoſe two paſſages, viz. *Sh. p.* 38, and 39. from whence Mr. *Sh.* commenceth two long Suits againſt Dr. *Owen*, giving him in the firſt place this Ironical Salute, *I ſhall not envy the Author the glory of this Diſcovery, and therefore ſhall honeſtly confeſs where I had it*, viz. *in a Book entituled Communion with God*, &c. *Written by* John Owen, D. D. *&c.*

Now

Now they that ſhall impartially read thoſe two paſſages quoted out of *J. O.* his Book of *Communion with God*, upon which Mr. *Sh.* chargeth him with ſetting up a *Religion of Chriſts Perſon*, in oppoſition to the *Religion of his Doctrine*, may eaſily ſee, that the *Premiſes* which Mr. *Sh.* produceth, will by no means bear the *Concluſion* which he draws from thence, or prove Dr. *O.* guilty of any ſuch Errour as he chargeth him with; but as the Proverb ſaith, *There is a great deal of Cry, and but a little Wooll.* The firſt paſſage in Dr. *J. O's.* Book, of which he makes ſo much uſe, is this: *Chriſt is not only the Wiſdome of God, but made Wiſdom to us, not only by teaching us wiſdome, as he is the great Prophet of the Church, but alſo becauſe by the knowing of him we become acquainted with the wiſdome of God, which is our wiſdome.* Thus far Dr. *O.* p. 87. Now what hurt in all this? At this great offence is taken by Mr. *Sh.* but I ſee none given. That *Chriſt is the wiſdome of God*, and not only ſo, but *made to us of God wiſdome*, is the very expreſſion of the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. That Chriſt teacheth us Wiſdom, as he is the great Prophet of the Church, is no Chriſtians doubt. Therefore the only words that have raiſed all this clamour are theſe: *but alſo becauſe by the knowing of him we become acquainted with the Wiſdome of God.* Here Mr. *Sh.* takes it for granted that by *him* is meant the *Perſon* of Chriſt, though the word Perſon is not once uſed in all this condemned paſſage: and though Mr. *Sh.* himſelf when he finds the word *Chriſt*, doth generally

nerally conſtrue it to mean the *Laws and Goſpel of Chriſt*, not his *Perſon*. Suppoſe we then that the *Perſon* of Chriſt was there intended by Dr. *J. O.* What falſe Divinity, or what bad ſenſe is there, in ſaying, that by knowing the Perſon of Chriſt, we become acquainted with the Wiſdome of God? I am bold to ſay that Acquaintance with the *Perſon* of Chriſt is one way to become acquainted with the Wiſdome of God: and Dr. *O.* ſaith no more: for he ſaith, *Chriſt is made Wiſdome to us not only by teaching us Wiſdome, as he is the great Prophet, but alſo becauſe by that knowing of him, we become to be acquainted with the Wiſdome of God.* Here Mr. *Sh.* may note that Dr. *O.* owneth that *Chriſt is made Wiſdome to us by teaching us Wiſdome*, that is, (as Mr. *Sh.* himſelf expounds it) *by the Doctrines he Preached, and thoſe Revelations he hath made of God's will.* How then doth Dr. *O.* exclude the Religion of Chriſt's *Law and Goſpel?* or ſet Acquaintance with his *Perſon*, in oppoſition to Acquaintance with his Goſpel? when you ſee he takes in both, in that ſingle paſſage which you firſt quarrel with? Is this fair play, Sir? would you be ſo ſerv'd your ſelf? At that rate a man may find fault with the moſt ſound, and judicious book that ever was written, yea with a book (if there were any ſuch) written by an holy Angel, and ſent down from Heaven. But whereas you ſtumble at thoſe words, *viz.* that *by the knowing of Chriſt his Perſon, we become acquainted with the Wiſdome of God*; to me they ſeem to be of eaſie, and ſafe interpretation. For firſt,

firſt, I am perſwaded that Chriſt executeth the Office of a *Prophet*, in revealing to us, not only by his *Word*, but alſo by his *Spirit*, the will of God for our Salvation. Now you ſeem to be of opinion that Chriſt revealeth his will to us only by his Word (For if by his *Spirit* alſo, doubtleſs Acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt by procuring us a greater effuſion of his ſpirit might increaſe our ſpiritual wiſdome.) I know another Gentleman of your opinion (if that be it) he, and his followers, *viz. Socinus Solut. ſcrup. Reſponſ.* 6. *Sacræ Scripturæ ita apertæ, atque expeditæ ſunt, ut nemo eas qui non intelligat plane ſtupidus non videatur.* Alſo *Simon Epiſcopius, Diſp.* 46. *priv. coral.* 1. *An ulla operatione Spiritus ſancti ſine ullo alio medio opus ſit, in voluntate, aut intellectu, aut in Scripturis promittatur, ad hoc ut quis credat, verbo externo propoſito? Nos Negativam tuebimur.* In plain *Engliſh*, the Tenet of the *Socinians* you know is, that God, and his will, may eaſily be known by meer reading of the Scripture, without any illumination from the Holy Ghoſt. You ſeem to be of the ſame mind, for that you reproach Dr. *Owen* for mentioning any other way whereby we may come acquainted with the Wiſdome of God than by the Revelations which he hath made of his will in the Scripture. If that be true, why doth Chriſt ſay, *John* 14. 26. *The Holy Ghoſt whom the Father will ſend in my name ſhall teach you all things.* We expect not that the Spirit of God ſhould reveal thoſe things to us, which are no where revealed in the Scriptures: but that he ſhould make us know

thoſe things more for our good, that he ſhould help us to underſtand what otherwiſe we ſhould not: therefore *David* ſaith, *Pſal.* 119. 18. *Open thou mine eyes that I may ſee wonderous things out of thy Law.* *John* 16. 13. *When the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth: for he ſhall not ſpeak of himſelf* (*viz.* any new Truths that Chriſt had not himſelf delivered) *but whatſoever he ſhall hear, that ſhall he ſpeak.* v. 14. *He ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it to you.* And as the Spirit of God expoundeth, ſo likewiſe he applyeth Truths to our hearts, *which* we our ſelves could not apply. *He witneſſeth with our Spirits that we are the Children of God, and cryeth in us, Abbah Father, and maketh us to know the things that are freely given us of God.*

But to come yet more cloſe, why ſhould Mr. *Sh.* make ſo ſtrange of this, that *by knowing of the Perſon of Chriſt we ſhould become more acquainted with the Wiſdom of God?* Is not *Col.* 2. 3. pertinently quoted by Dr. *Owen* to confirm it, *viz. For in him dwell all the Treaſures of wiſdom and knowledge?* Let Mr. *Sh.* diſprove if he can, that thoſe words do moſt directly refer to the *Perſon* of Chriſt. I have elſewhere ſhewed great probability for it. Now, to be acquainted with him in whom are all the Treaſures of wiſdom, is ſure one good way to be wiſe. Eſpecially conſidering that it is his Office as Prophet of the Church to teach us, and *his Lips are to preſerve knowledge*, and he is appointed of God to be to us wiſdom, *&c.* But moreover the very *Perſon* of Chriſt is a moſt excellent Glaſs, in which

which to behold the wiſdom, and all other the Attributes of God the Father, ſith Chriſt is *the expreſs Image of his Father's Perſon, and the brightneſs of his glory.* Did not Chriſt ſay to *Philip*, John 14. 9. *He that hath ſeen me hath ſeen the Father, and how ſayeſt thou then, ſhew us the Father?* That Text is alſo greatly to our purpoſe, 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. *God hath ſhined in our hearts to give the Light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the Face of Jeſus Chriſt.* Let Mr *Sh.* deny then if he can, that knowing of Chriſt, is the way to more acquaintance with the Wiſdom of God, *&c.*

The other paſſage in Dr. *Owen's* Book, *Of Communion*, p. 92. is this, *Theſe properties of God (his pardoning Mercy, &c.) Chriſt hath revealed in his Doctrine in that revelation which he had made of God and his Will, but the Life of this knowledge lies in Acquaintance with his Perſon, wherein the expreſs Image, and beams of this glory of his Father doth ſhine forth.* That is, that theſe things, *are clearly, eminently, and ſavingly to be diſcover'd in Jeſus Chriſt.* I ſay, this is that other paſſage of Dr. *Owen's*, upon which Mr. *Sh.* builds his Accuſation, that Dr. *Owen* rejecteth the *Religion of Chriſt his Law and Goſpel*, and betaketh himſelf only to the *Religion of Chriſt's Perſon*, and to *Acquaintance with his Perſon.* But how injurioully, he that runs may read; for Dr. *Owen's* words are, that *The Properties* (or Attributes) *of God Chriſt hath revealed in his Doctrine, in that Revelation which he hath made of God and his Will* (that is, in the Holy

Holy Scriptures) How then doth Dr. *Owen* reject Acquaintance with the Gospel of Christ? Indeed he saith, that *the Life of this knowledge lyes in Acquaintance with his Person, or that they are eminently, clearly, and savingly to be discovered in Jesus Christ.* What Acquaintance with Christ is in Dr. *Owen*'s Divinity, Mr. *Sh.* tells us, p. 38. *viz. a knowledge what Christ is, hath done, and suffered for us*; moreover, *an Experimental knowledge of these things* it is that Mr. Sh. saith, Dr. *Owen*, and such as he, pretend unto, p. 139. Now as Mr. *Sh.* hath explained him, I think Dr. *Owen* hath said very well, for what will it profit any man to have the *Letter* of the Scripture at his fingers ends, all by heart, as they say, yea, a competent knowledge of the sense and meaning thereof, if he have not that which St. *Paul* did profess himself to thirst after, *Phil.* 3. *v.* 10. viz. *that he might know Christ, and the power of his Resurrection, and the Fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death.* Surely the Life of knowledge is so to know Christ as to believe in him, to love, delight, trust in, obey, and study to please him, above all others, to know the power of his Death, and Resurrection, *&c.* and that is the knowledge Dr. *Owen* speaketh of, and who dare, in express terms, contradict that assertion? Upon the whole matter I find Mr. *Sh.* had as little reason to quarrel Dr. *Owen* for what he hath written touching this matter as those two Brothers, of whom *Camerarius* speaketh in his *Horæ subcisivæ*, had to quarrel, and kill

kill one another, which was but this. Walking out together in a brave Star-light night, one of them, who was a *Graſier*, wiſht that all the Firmament were one Rich Meadow, and his: the other being a *Butcher*, wiſht that all the Stars in the Sky were ſo many large Oxen. The Graſier replyed, what would you do with your Oxen? Said the Butcher, I would put them into your Meadow; but you ſhould not Brother, ſaid the Graſier; yea, Brother, but I would, ſaid the Butcher; and ſo they quarrelled (ſaith my Author) till they kill'd one another. I ſay, Mr. *Sh.* in reference to what Dr. *Owen* hath ſaid about our acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt, had no more cauſe to quarrel him, than the Graſier had his Brother the Butcher, for ſaying if all the Stars were Oxen he would put them in his Meadow (if all the Sky were that) and the other him for ſaying he ſhould not. I wiſh Mr. *Sh.* to conſider, that as the *Fall* of Man came in at firſt by means of affecting undue knowledge, *viz. to be like God, knowing good and Evil.* So Man's Recovery is appointed to be by means of that knowledge which is proper for him, according to that of our Saviour, *John* 17. 3. *This is Life Eternal, to know thee, and Jeſus Chriſt, whom thou haſt ſent.* Let him therefore take heed how he derides that kind of knowledge which alone is ſaving.

Let him alſo remember, that at that great day every body that can make the leaſt pretence thereunto, will lay claim to Acquaintance with Jeſus Chriſt (which he hath ſo much expoſed) and

and that it had been better for any man never to have been born, than when he shall knock at Heaven Gate, to be answered, For what Acquaintance knock you here? *Depart, I know you not.* In that day the *Acquaintances of Jesus Christ*, will appear to be the only happy persons: and I dare say himself will with, if he continue to despise them (as such) that he had rather cast in his lot amongst them. God grant that I may be ignorant of all things else, rather than of Jesus Christ, and him Crucified: For St. *Paul determined to know* (that is to make known) nothing else but that amongst the *Corinthians* 2 *Cor.* 2. 2. I shall conclude this Chapter with those words of the great Apostle, *Phil.* 3. 8. *Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellencies of the knowledg of Jesus Christ my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Reader, For the Reason rendered at the end of my Prodromus, *I shall leave it to thy self candidly to correct the Typographical Errours, advertizing thee but of two*: viz. *In* p. 205. l. 12. *for* manifold, *read* manifest. *and in* p. 209. l. 12. *be sure in stead of* Man, *to read* God-man.